

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



131 861

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY SERIES

KIMBALL YOUNG, GENERAL EDITOR

Edited by KIMBALL YOUNG

THE COMMUNITY AND SOCIETY

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY

By LORAN D. OSBORN

Los Angeles Institute of Family Relations,
and

MARTIN H. NEUMEYER

University of Southern California

CURRENT SOCIAL PROBLEMS

By JOHN M. GILLETTE

University of North Dakota,
and

JAMES M. REINHARDT

University of Nebraska

AN INTRODUCTORY SOCIOLOGY

By KIMBALL YOUNG

University of Wisconsin

SOURCE BOOK FOR SOCIOLOGY

By KIMBALL YOUNG

University of Wisconsin

JUVENILE PROBATION

By BELLE BOONE BEARD

Sweet Briar College

PERSONALITY ADJUSTMENT AND DOMESTIC DISCORD

By HARRIET R. MOWRER

Jewish Social Service Bureau of Chicago

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY SERIES

PERSONALITY ADJUSTMENT
AND DOMESTIC DISCORD

BY

HARRIET R. MOWRER

Domestic Discord Consultant of the Jewish Social Service Bureau, Chicago



AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY
NEW YORK · CINCINNATI · CHICAGO · BOSTON · ATLANTA

COPYRIGHT, 1935, BY
AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY
All rights reserved

Mowrer, Personality Adjustment
W. P. 1

MADE IN U. S. A.

•

TO
V. C. F.
AND THE
J.S.S.B.

•

THE PREPARATION OF THIS BOOK FOR PUBLICATION WAS MADE

POSSIBLE BY GRANTS-IN-AID OF RESEARCH

FROM

THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL, INC.,

AND

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

Mrs. Mowrer's interpretation of personality disorganization as manifested in family life is a genuine contribution to sociology, to social psychology, and to social work. She has at once drawn upon the contributions of cultural anthropology, dynamic psychology, including psychoanalysis, and the sociology of interaction. Mrs. Mowrer is convinced, and with good point, too, that better diagnosis and better treatment result from the fact that one sees one's materials in terms of mental mechanisms on the one hand, and in terms of social interaction on the other—both of these projected upon a varying cultural and experiential background of the individuals involved. Furthermore, she has made clear that theory and systematic interpretation may be drawn from data based on case materials. That is to say, actual cases of the sort she has described and analyzed for purposes of personality and family therapy have a meaning for the broader systematic field with which sociology is concerned.

In order to indicate more clearly the nature of Mrs. Mowrer's contribution, I shall discuss briefly the four most significant features of her standpoint and interpretation. These are (1) the place of culture in personality differences; (2) the patterns of social interaction, especially those which develop in the early years of life; (3) the nature and direction of mental mechanisms as they are affected by culture and interaction; and (4) the problem of methods of analysis and that of treatment or therapy.

(1) *The Place of Culture in Personality Differences.* The traditional approach of the academic psychologist to personality analysis has been to present a listing or description of separate traits and abilities (inherited or acquired), of mental mecha-

nisms, or of mental faculties, from which materials he proceeds to produce, somewhat in the manner of the magician and the hat, the personality as we find it in the concrete situations of daily life. While no one doubts that the biological mechanisms are the foundation of behavior, the direction of personal development and the content of behavior (if I may use this expression to distinguish culture and other objects of attention and action from mechanism) can be understood only in terms of the society and its culture in which the individual is brought up and in which the basic attitudes and habits are first manifest.

The author shows at almost every point throughout her cases the all-pervading effect of variations in cultural background. The pious and orthodox family life of the Jew of the ghetto provides an attitude toward marital adjustments and family relations in sharp contrast to the attitude of the unorthodox and cosmopolitan individual who has been affected by Bohemian or other radical ideas and practices. On the marriage of persons of different religious or denominational backgrounds furnishes an arena in which conflict may easily emerge. The strong patriarchal patterns of family life developed through centuries fall into conflict with the modern romantic pattern of individual choice of mates. The disgrace attendant upon spinsterhood which lies deep in European cultures becomes the motivation for many a woman to accept as husband a man who is not altogether satisfactory from an American romantic standpoint, but who will apparently be "a good husband and father."

In like manner, culture patterns bearing on the economic role of the husband or of the wife profoundly influence their relations with each other and with their children. The wife from a thrifty, hard-working family finds it difficult to get along with a spendthrift husband whose own culture background has furnished him no ideas of such thrift.

The broader and more extensive the range of cultural differences is, in fact, the more likelihood there seems to be for misunderstanding and conflict to arise between spouses. The intimacy of interaction in the family, furthermore, makes

these divergences all the more apparent. It is this situation which makes the marriage of immigrant girls and native sons, of colored and white, of rich and poor, so fraught with probabilities of disaster. In the same manner, in the cases which came before her clinic, Mrs. Mowrer found that she had always to probe into the cultural background as well as into other features of personal history if she was to understand the current situations out of which the conflict, on first glance, seemed to arise. And yet it is clear that culture, like the patterns of social interaction, frequently provides symbols for other sorts of attitudes and ideas or else furnishes convenient rationalizations for conduct not otherwise understandable. (See below, Section 4.)

(2) *The Patterns of Interaction.* The personality grows up from one's interaction with his fellows in the family and in other primary groups. Baldwin, Cooley, Mead, and Dewey have made clear to us that our own ideas, attitudes, and habits are really social products—are in a broad sense the reflections of other people's interpretations of us coupled with our own reorganization of these reflections into something of a generalized mental image of ourselves.

The two most important sociological concepts which have been developed in the analysis of interaction are role and status. The *role* has to do with the function or activity of the individual as a member of the various groups to which he belongs. It is rather literally his "role" or "part" in the drama of life, and is associated in principle with social differentiation. *Status*, on the other hand, arises from the prestige, influence, or power which is attributed to a person by others and which he, in turn, comes to assume about himself. Status is sometimes incorrectly used to refer only to high standing, but actually it has to do with the position of an individual anywhere along a scale of prestige recognized by others—which position comes usually to be accepted by the individual himself.

The basic roles of the individual are likely to be determined by the close relationships of the child and his family members. His submission to persons in authority or dominance, his occupational choices, his religious and political preferences, and any

number of other attitudes generally arise out of the first contacts of the child with members of his family. Thus in the strongly patriarchal family, the eldest son, while submissive to the father, in time takes over his elder's role and status, while the other sons may find themselves in a correspondingly lower status at all times. In the Chinese family, to take another example, the status of the girl child was so distinctly inferior to that of her brother that it colored the relations of the sexes throughout life.

In the field of marital adaptation, however, the patterns of interaction which are most telling are those of a more intimate sort. "Intimate" here, however, need not refer only to sexual contacts, but to all those close give-and-take relations of people in love or in close proximity which provide the patterns of successful and peaceful adaptation or its opposite, conflict.

Interactional patterns are not entirely due to culture, but arise often at a sub-cultural or social-personal level in terms of age differences, divergences in the strength of emotional expression, and the like. The field of intimate response (which W. I. Thomas made one of his fundamental wishes) is particularly likely to be affected by these sub-cultural forms of interaction. The patterns of affection between a favorite son and his mother may well establish in him attitudes of dependence toward his mother-image that will carry over into his later marriage relations and profoundly affect his adjustment to his wife. His need, for example, for being told that he is a sweet, good boy who loves his mother—a pattern that developed in childhood—may carry over into adulthood, taking the form of unconscious demands for the praise and flattery that are essential to the preservation of his ego. If his wife cannot fulfill this mother-image demand, the conflict of the couple over quite other matters may find its deepest seat of infection in situations calling for intimate response.

The author has admirably shown that the desire for intimate, congenial, and comrade-like response is often the basis for difficulties in marriage and family life. The craving for attention, the need for mutual understanding may, in fact, far outweigh difficulties in sexual adjustment itself.

Nevertheless, the place of sexual adjustment must not and cannot be overlooked. Over and over again it is apparent from the cases that the problem of mutual understanding and adaptation in this area of interaction was a stumbling block to continuity of the family itself. As Mrs. Mowrer says, "The phase of relations in which conflict first originates is that of sex. This is probably true because it is the earliest relationship demanding an adjustment." Later, of course, the sexual maladjustment itself becomes both a symbol and a rationalization for other ego manifestations. (See below, Section 3.)

The field of sexual adaptation well illustrates the place of culture in determining the lines of important interaction. Most of the women cited in Mrs. Mowrer's cases were brought up in a culture which looked upon sexual manifestations as lewd, nasty, and sinful. Sexual intercourse was supposed to be carried on for procreation only. There is in such cultures as those described no preparation for the physical manifestations of marital relations, and the resulting shock to the ego of the woman is noticeable in any number of instances. And the only comfort which many of them got upon consulting their own mothers was the culturalized rationalization that "all men are that way."

As a matter of fact, the reading of the cases in this volume makes one aware of the lack of socially accepted and intelligent patterns of culture which would prepare our boys and girls and young men and women for a more adequate and happier marriage and family life. Our whole social relationship in courtship, for example, tends to be artificial and superficial. Fundamental matters like understanding overt sexuality, habits of personal hygiene, and sleeping habits are neglected; or, if handled or discussed at all, are either put into the euphemisms of "polite" society or left to the level of the bar-room humorist.

(3) *The Nature and Direction of Mental Mechanisms.* It is clear from the cases in this book, as it has long been clear from the work of psychiatrists and psychoanalysts dealing with neurotics, that the behavior mechanisms of the adult develop during childhood and carry over into his adolescence and later

years. The whole principle of continuity of behavior patterns from childhood into adulthood is, in fact, basic to the understanding of personality.

In her descriptions and interpretations the author has drawn freely upon the mental mechanisms which have been exposed and studied by dynamic psychology, especially that phase of it known to us as psychoanalysis. Although she has made no attempt to deal with the entire gamut of psychoanalytic concepts, her materials do bring out a number of important mechanisms. Moreover, her cases show that these mechanisms never stand alone but are always related to objects in experience. Thus, the place of ambivalence and dissociation is admirably shown in Chapter IV in the case of Mr. E., who lived a dual life, one role representing the conventional family man and stable business associate, the other typifying the non-conventional, Bohemian, radical patterns of action characterized by "free love," careless spending of money, and lack of acceptable business prudence.

Other cases reveal the importance and function of various so-called escape mechanisms which I rather prefer to conceive of not as "escape" but as forms of substitutive and symbolic behavior which secure an adjustment at the level of wishful thinking and action. Illness thus becomes a device of power over others, a means of securing attention, and of preventing the other spouse from deserting. Or, again, drink furnishes a substitute response for loss of ego and status. Fantasy thinking or daydreaming itself is sometimes indulged in as a method of offsetting a drab and unsatisfying existence. In our own society, in fact, illness offers a socially accepted form of "escape" or substitute. Alcoholism, on the contrary, is frowned upon, and while it affords temporary restitution of the sense of power, its physiological and psychological effects are too evidently disintegrating for it to gain wide recognition as a socially desirable form of substitution. Daydreaming, on the contrary, is always available and unless excessive and manifest in overt psychopathic behavior is a form of substitution that produces a certain emotional balance, although it lacks the overt features of person-to-person interaction and in this sense is "non-social."

The function of rationalization and its social acceptance within the framework of a particular culture are well demonstrated in the concrete materials. It has already been noted above how the culture patterns provide the rationalizations for all sorts of action and ideas. The deprivation of the masculine ego of its traditional power in the home may produce an overt attempt to regain this wonted power which, in turn, is excused or defended on the grounds of the patriarchal culture.

One of the most important contributions of these cases, however, is the clear demonstration of the need to understand symbolic action. Upon analysis much overt conduct turns out to be symbolic of some underlying desire for power, for attention, for sympathy, or for understanding. Thus clothes become the center of interest, symbolising attention-getting that may have its roots in earliest childhood, just as drink may give the ego a chance to express its power. "Economic conflict, for example, is many times symbolic of underlying sex conflict, no trace of which appears on the surface. Or, at more conscious levels, the husband withholds support after repeated refusals of sexual relations on the part of the wife. The implication here is that the wife does not deserve support if she is not a 'wife.' "

Here a close approach is made to the importance of unconscious factors in the personality, which Mrs. Mowrer, because of the nature of her clinical situation and of her patients, had to effect by the conscious interview method. (See next section.) There is ample evidence of the great weight which must be given to the earliest expressions of ego and love traits which in adulthood find their outlets in representative or symbolic form. Tied to these symbolic manifestations is the sense of guilt and of sin which in our Western culture is so closely associated with sexual life. The sense of shame, the disgust with the physical expressions of love life, and the growing resistance to the spouse who manifests these physical interests frequently lie in the earliest infancy and childhood training of the spouse and not in the marital situation at all. The latter but becomes the contemporary situation in which these unconscious patterns express

themselves. So, too, overt acts are often symbolic forms to expiate the sense of guilt.

(4) *Methods of Analysis and of Therapy*. The main thesis of Mrs. Mowrer is that satisfactory treatment can rest only upon adequate analysis of the situation and of the background out of which personality difficulties in marriage arise. Like other recent students of family life, she contends that through scientific diagnosis the relations of spouses may be improved and the personalities of the married pair bettered. Everywhere there is recognition of the drifting home and of the maladjustments in the marital and other familial relations. Yet many people rather resent the implication that we can or should study these matters objectively. Are marriage and family life, then, too sacred and too intimate to be analyzed and prescribed for? In recent years a great deal of advancement has been made in diagnosing and predicting the behavior of children on the basis of scientific analysis. Is there any reason why we cannot in similar manner make an objective study of personality in reference to marital situations? Actually, of course, we have. The whole psychoanalytic school has done much to expose the foundations of personality problems, particularly in family relations. G. V. Hamilton in his *Research in Marriage* (1929) reports an investigation in which the interview method was used. Using clinical records, Robert L. Dickinson and Lura Beam in their *A Thousand Marriages* (1931) have exposed large numbers of these problems and have offered diagnostic and prognostic advice. E. R. Mowrer in his *Family Disorganization* (1927) and in *Domestic Discord* (1928) has brought out important ecological and social psychological features of family disintegration. It was, in fact, out of collaboration with her husband on the latter book that Mrs. Mowrer went on to develop the present study. More recently E. W. Burgess and Leonard Cottrell have attempted to analyze the factors making for success or failure in the marriage life, and still others have reported further studies, both of statistical and of case study sort.

The method of analysis used in the present study was largely that of the consciously directed interview. And while Mrs.

Mowrer has confined herself chiefly to the materials of conscious recall, she has drawn upon psychoanalytic concepts, in part, in her interpretations. Yet there was no effort to probe into the unconscious by any of the known techniques.

A number of important points are brought out in her use of the consciously directed interview. In the prolonged interview there is an opportunity to develop confidence and *rapprochement* between patient and interviewer. This affords a situation favorable to exposure of the roots of the present difficulty, which are to be found in the earlier years. Such analysis helps the patient to understand that his difficulties do not entirely or even chiefly arise out of some recent or present situation at home. Moreover, the interviews provide some of the cathartic value of the confessional. The mere technique of listening to a patient's story has its place, while as Mrs. Mowrer says, "The verbalization of repressed emotions, is, in fact, the most important of cathartic releases."

Another factor to be reckoned with is the time necessary to produce changes in personality organization. The psychoanalysts have made clear the depth of early patterns and the relatively long period of analysis necessary for the patient to rebuild his life organization. On the other hand, the psychology of conversion, seen in both religious and politico-economic experience, has shown us that occasionally a reorganization of personality may take place rather rapidly. In the cases studied by Mrs. Mowrer there is none of this sudden change. She did not have an opportunity for the intensive study which must be given in psychoanalysis, but she saw her patients for rather extended periods. On the basis of the understanding and insight gained by the patients from the conscious interview, most of them were able to improve their marital and family relations. Although her method was not that of psychoanalysis, her success in helping her patients to readjust themselves raises again the problem as to whether psychoanalysis is necessary in many cases of this sort. If a working relationship can be established between husband and wife, is it necessary to probe further? It is a far cry from the recognition of the therapeutic and theo-

retical uses of psychoanalysis to the contention that every person suffering from personality imbalance must or should be psychoanalyzed.

The relation of therapeutic and theoretical values in these studies is well brought out in the emphasis on sequences and life cycles. In having his early habits and attitudes and their relation to his own family and community backgrounds exposed to him through the interview, the patient develops the insight and knowledge which will help him to reorganize his present behavior. At the same time, this presentation of the sequence of events in the life of the individual gives further evidence of the need to reckon with these factors in any theory of personality development. To confine our attention in our objective study to a cross section of the personality at the adult level by methods of tests, questionnaires, or interviews is to produce material which will likely result in a pseudo-scientific rationalization of the very sore-thumb analogy which is common to the patients themselves. That is, there is danger of our over-emphasizing the immediate adult situations as "causes," ignoring in the meantime the genetic factors. The historical perspective is absolutely essential if we are to understand the function of habits and attitudes in the adult.

One's theory need not follow the psychoanalytic or any other school, but we may accept as fundamental a number of points as important. These may be noted briefly as follows: (1) the recognition of the continuity of behavior and of thought patterns from childhood to maturity; (2) the symbolic character of much of adult behavior, the affective meaning of which lies in the earlier years and in regard to other objects; (3) the recognition of expectancy in behavior, that is, that individuals respond to each other in terms of anticipated reactions; and (4) that role and status, which are both so important in group life, rest upon these early social interactions.

In conclusion, then, it may be said that Mrs. Mowrer has made a valuable contribution by bringing together the standpoints of sociology, social psychology, and psychoanalysis in analyzing and treating a number of personalities who have

found difficulties in their marital relations. From sociology has come the recognition of the importance of cultural backgrounds and of group life; from social psychology the recognition of the importance of early interactions, in particular, in building the habits and attitudes of individuals in reference to each other; and from psychoanalysis the recognition of the importance of the mental mechanisms operating as they do upon objects in experience. When the interplay of these factors is understood, there will be a means of diagnosing difficulties and assisting in therapy, from which in turn a better systematic and theoretical picture of the meaning of personality in its social milieu may be constructed.

KIMBALL YOUNG

FOREWORD

† Family adjustment in the past was in the control of the mores. In our generation, the family and its problems have become the subject matter of the biological, the psychological, and the social sciences.

‡ The decline of the influence of the mores in the regulation of the family is the natural outcome of the technological changes which have undermined and are rapidly destroying a social order essentially "rural" in its nature, and creating a society which for purposes of contrast may be termed "urban."

¶ In the rural economy that is passing, the family rather than the individual was the economic unit. The family, not the individual, was also the social unit. The stability of the family as an economic and social institution was of paramount concern in the mores. The personality development of its members was of decidedly secondary consideration. The conventional roles of husband and wife, of parents and children, were closely defined in the mores and enforced by the overwhelming pressure of the intimate and face-to-face contacts of the rural and village neighborhood.

* In the urban community the family is ceasing to be an economic and social unit. As shown by W. F. Ogburn and Clark Tibbitts in *Recent Social Trends* the family is losing or has lost nearly all of its historic institutional functions: economic, educational, religious, recreational and protective. The affectional function alone seems to be least affected and it is the least institutional.

It is in the cities and in their most urban centers, as in rooming-house areas, in apartment-house districts and in the

exclusive, wealthy colonies that the problems of family adjustment seem most acute. At any rate, these are the areas of the highest divorce rates. The sections of the city with the highest rates of desertion, "the poor man's divorce," are ports of first entry inhabited by immigrant families transplanted from the peasant villages of Europe or from Southern plantations to the bewildering mazes and confusion of the American metropolitan community.

The mores regulating family life in the rural neighborhood break down in the city. Only in residential urban suburbs are the natural instruments of control by the mores, namely, gossip, intimacy, community opinion, still more or less effective. With the decline in its institutional functions the stability of the family comes more and more to depend upon the affection and congeniality of its members and less and less upon their conceptions of duty and convention.

The decline in the control of the mores over the family is no longer limited to the city. The new instruments of mobility and communication, the automobile, the motion picture and the radio are destroying familial and communal control in the rural community as well.

It is, however, in the urban environment with its heterogeneous social worlds, with its conflict of cultures, with its confusion of moral standards, with its commercialization of appeals to human impulses, that the problems of family adjustment are most acute. It is in the city also that the biological, psychological, and social sciences have been called upon for their contribution to the solution of the problems of family and marital maladjustment. To science rather than to the mores must we look in the future for assistance in the solution of familial problems.

It is only natural that certain students of the family have discovered the central maladjustment in marriage to lie in the physical and physiological aspects of sex; that some have been concerned with the unconscious motivations influencing familial behavior; that others have emphasized economic factors; and that still others have stressed the interaction of tempera-

mental and personal traits of the adjustment of individuals in marriage. Each of these points of view has made its own distinctive contribution to the study of the family. Each has, however, lacked orientation in some common frame of reference for a more inclusive explanation of marital adjustment.

In the judgment of the writer, this volume by Harriet R. Mowrer does present a central frame of orientation for studies of family adjustment from different points of view. This is in terms of husband and wife as two culturally conditioned personalities interacting with each other and with their social milieu.

The theoretical standpoint of this volume is solidly grounded upon the social psychology of W. I. Thomas, Charles H. Cooley, and George H. Mead. Personality is conceived as "the subjective aspect of culture"; the person and society are defined in their organic interrelationships; and familial behavior is explained in terms of the interacting roles of husband and wife.

From this organic cultural standpoint, sex, for instance, is primarily conceived not as physical or physiological but as defined in the attitudes toward it in a given culture. Marital maladjustments are to be studied accordingly in the light of the life histories of the husband and of the wife. Their behavior and their attitudes are to be explained by reference to their conceptions of their respective roles in the process of familial interaction.

Methods of research and of therapy are in conformity with this basic point of view. In the group of cases upon which this work is based both husband and wife were interviewed in order to secure a verbatim record of the life history and marital experiences of each. The art of the interview as developed by the author is described in detail and will be of outstanding service to all clinical students of family relationships. Equally valuable is the outline of the data to be covered in the interview which is ingeniously disguised to cover all the concrete points of family conflict, but always in their organic setting in social interaction and in a cultural situation.

Verbatim reporting of interviews deserves especial mention.

In the cases reported in this volume the personality and attitudes of husband and wife stand out in clear relief and do not suffer the obscuring effect which almost inevitably results from translation into the language of the third person. Besides, verbatim documents are objective in the sense that every student is permitted to make his own independent examination and interpretation of them.

In the research work of Mrs. Mowrer is found one of the unusual instances of a fruitful combination of original scientific work and of successful therapy. In fact, it may be asserted that the test of the validity of the hypotheses of the causation of family discord is to be found in the success or failure of therapy as determined by the theoretical analysis. The author of this work has the courage to accept this challenge. Her outline of the treatment process and her analysis of its effects in the cases studied will be particularly welcomed by those now engaged in family counseling.

This volume should have a wide use as textbook and reference work for college and university courses, as a working manual for those employed in family interviewing and clinical treatment, and by all who are seeking further light upon an understanding of the factors at work in family interaction.

ERNEST W. BURGESS

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

No problem in the modern world touches intimately the lives of so wide and varied a group as that of marriage adjustment. Whether as a participant in a marriage relationship, or as an outsider viewing the marriages of others, the problem of marriage adjustment has universal appeal. But when the stability of the marriage is threatened, this passive identification with the romantic elements turns to a fear of consequences and a demand for understanding and intelligent action.

Yet few persons who have listened to the marital troubles of others—the social worker, the lawyer, the minister, the physician, the family research worker, and the jurist—have not been struck by the inadequacy of our knowledge and by the absence of well-defined techniques of social therapy for dealing with the problem. These limitations, for the most part, have grown out of an inadequate conception of the nature of domestic discord and a failure to recognize the complexity of the treatment process.

One of the most important aspects of domestic discord is the relationship of marriage adjustment to the personality development of the individuals. That the individual attempts to adjust himself to the demands of marriage, therefore, in the same way in which he has met previous crisis situations is central to the discussion which follows. Thus the pattern of domestic discord is determined to a large extent by the ways in which the individual has adjusted to problems prior to marriage.

Treatment, the author is convinced, requires a radical departure from current practices. A more adequate approach seems to be the clinical in which the treatment is worked out

with as much experimental control as is possible in the field of human behavior.

This book has grown out of eight years' experience of the author, first, as a specialized worker with domestic-discord problems, and second, as Domestic-Discord Consultant at the Jewish Social Service Bureau of Chicago and as a private consultant, preceded by several years of general family case work. In the capacity of a specialized worker serious cases of domestic discord were interviewed and treated extensively over a period of approximately two years. At the Social Service Bureau cases were referred to the writer by district workers. Both husband and wife were then interviewed and, upon the basis of an analysis of the data obtained, treatment programs were formulated and initiated. Periods of treatment varied from two to four years. As private consultant the writer followed essentially the same procedure, except that cases were referred by interested persons acquainted with the service offered, and the writer was wholly responsible for the treatment just as she had been previously as a specialized worker.

The persons worked with do not constitute in any sense a unique group. They varied widely as to social status, years of marriage, degree of Americanization when foreign-born, degree of urbanization, religious emancipation, educational attainment, etc. All were of so-called adequate intelligence. While the larger percentage of individuals were Jewish, the writer has had sufficient contact with non-Jewish cases to feel that the patterns of domestic discord herein presented are not peculiar to any ethnic group.

It is with some reluctance that any statistical findings have been presented with respect to outcome of treatment since the number of cases is relatively small. Furthermore many cases were treated while the technique was in the earlier stage of development, whereas many of the more recent cases have not been included. Also the test of any social treatment lies as much in its consistency and in its indication of understanding of human nature as in any categorical characterization of results to be found in a statistical table.

Neither does the author regard her system of interpretation as final, but presents it as one which has worked pragmatically and has served as the frame of reference for a technique which she believes is communicable to others.

The book has been written with several audiences in mind: (1) social workers connected with family case-work agencies; (2) clinicians in agencies specializing in the treatment of domestic discord; (3) lawyers, physicians, and clergymen who are often called upon for advice in family problems; (4) scholars engaged in family research; and (5) advanced students in university courses of Family Case Work, Personality, and the Family.*

The writer wishes to acknowledge her indebtedness to the Social Science Research Council for a grant-in-aid which made possible the preparation of the manuscript for publication. She is similarly indebted to the University of Chicago for a supplementary grant.

For point of view and training in the fields of social psychology and sociology the writer is indebted to Professors Ellsworth Faris, Ernest W. Burgess, and Robert E. Park, of the University of Chicago. For training in the techniques of general family case work she is indebted to the Jewish Social Service Bureau of Chicago.

The writer wishes to acknowledge her indebtedness especially to Virginia C. Frank, Executive Director of the Jewish Social Service Bureau of Chicago, without whose encouragement and co-operation the work would not have developed; to Harry L. Lurie, formerly Superintendent of the Jewish Social Service Bureau, under whom the consultation work was started in 1927; to the case work and supervisory staff and Board of Directors of the Bureau for their generous co-operation and interest; to Professor William F. Ogburn of the University of Chicago, for his interest and assistance in securing the original grant-in-aid; to Professor Ernest W. Burgess, for reading the manuscript and for invaluable suggestions and direction, in

*Those who wish to understand more clearly the theoretical background out of which this book has grown are referred to Ernest R. Mowrer's *The Family: Its Organization and Disorganization*, University of Chicago Press, 1932.

addition to his assistance in securing the grants-in-aid; to Professor Kimball Young of the University of Wisconsin, for his critical reading of the manuscript and for his interest and enthusiasm in bringing the book to publication; and most of all to Dr. Ernest R. Mowrer for his constant encouragement, stimulation, and invaluable assistance.

HARRIET R. MOWRER

Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION	vii
FOREWORD by Professor E. W. Burgess	xix
AUTHOR'S PREFACE	xxiii

PART ONE

METHODOLOGY OF THE CLINICAL APPROACH

CHAPTER

I. THE CLINICAL APPROACH TO DOMESTIC DISCORD	3
II. THE INTERVIEW	12

PART TWO

PERSONALITY TYPES AND DOMESTIC DISCORD

III. PERSONALITY ADJUSTMENT AND DOMESTIC DISCORD	35
IV. CONFLICTING ROLES	51
V. DUAL ROLES AND DOMESTIC DISCORD	70
VI. THE ESCAPE RESPONSE PATTERN: ILLNESS	88
VII. DRINK AS AN ESCAPE MECHANISM	109
VIII. PHANTASY AND DOMESTIC DISCORD	125

PART THREE

DOMESTIC-DISCORD PATTERNS

IX. DOMESTIC-DISCORD PATTERNS: SEX CONFLICT	149
X. THE RESPONSE CONFLICT PATTERN	170
XI. CULTURAL CONFLICT	191

PART FOUR

TREATMENT OF DOMESTIC DISCORD

XII. ANALYSIS AND TREATMENT	215
XIII. TREATMENT PROCESSES	239
A STATISTICAL POSTSCRIPT	273
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHIES	275
INDEX	281

•

PART ONE

METHODOLOGY OF THE CLINICAL APPROACH

•

CHAPTER I

THE CLINICAL APPROACH TO DOMESTIC DISCORD

Domestic Discord has long held the interest of humanist and scientist alike. For the scientist it has furnished a problem of study and speculation about the nature of conflict in marriage relations. The pursuit of this approach leads to classification of types of domestic discord and to generalizations concerning the causes and processes of marital conflict.

The humanist, on the other hand, is a practical man. He is impatient with the theories of the scientist and looks upon each case of domestic conflict as a situation requiring action in the interests of the mutual happiness of the persons concerned.

Between these two groups there has been a gulf which to many seemed impassable. The scientist has charged the humanist with attempting to act without knowing the nature and causes of the situation of domestic conflict. The humanist has countered with the charge that the scientist deals only with esoteric theories which have no practical application for the solution of marital problems.

In the controversy it seems seldom or never to have occurred to the scientist that only through the therapeutic process can the validity of his ideas be tested. He appears not fully to have recognized the fact that the treatment process constitutes the nearest available approximation to experimental control. In the situation of therapy it is possible for the scientist to take his theories and reformulate them into procedures of control. If this control is successful, this fact itself confirms the validity of the theory. Otherwise there can be only conjecture and faith.

The humanist, on the other hand, has failed to recognize that only through thorough and patient research into causes can

therapy prove successful. Treatment cannot in the long run proceed successfully upon the basis of hunches, emotional interests, and wish projections. These must always be subordinated to a clear unbiased understanding of the fundamental factors involved and must constantly be subjected to the test of verification. Therapy based upon preconceptions is quite as sterile as research checked only by speculation.

A further advantage of this combined point of view is that it corrects one of the most serious defects in the past study of domestic discord. Not being interested in therapy, the scientist has had to depend upon the generosity or good will of persons who were willing to lend themselves for study. By being able to assume the responsibility of treatment, on the other hand, the position of the research worker is changed from that of a "sympathetic inquisitor" to one who can offer professional services. The result is that the motivating attitudes do not produce a biased selection of cases as is likely to be the situation where no assistance is to be obtained.)

Where no professional service is offered, the person experiencing domestic conflict does not have the same incentive to lend himself for a study from which he feels he will derive little or no benefit. The result is that for the most part those individuals who revel in attention are inclined to offer their services. Even these persons maintain some social distance, thus making for selection in the details obtained. This grows out of the fact that the relationship between research worker and subject is necessarily somewhat different than that between therapist and patient. Furthermore, the probability of securing equal and unqualified co-operation of both husband and wife is diminished under these circumstances. In fact, as results of such studies have shown, the investigator has to be content with a low proportion of marriage pairs to the total number of persons involved. In domestic discord, where it is always essential to interview both husband and wife, no multiplication of the number of individuals interviewed will offset what is lost by not having in each case both sides to the controversy.

A further consequence of the clinical approach is a greater

appreciation of the complexity of domestic discord. In the past, domestic discord has been approached chiefly in terms of the relationship between husband and wife, attempting to relate the conflict to certain events in married life. While the importance of the backgrounds of the individuals has been recognized, these past studies did not contemplate that domestic discord might be another phase of the conflict arising out of personality and therefore constituting a part of the larger conflict pattern.

There are, of course, cases in which personality disorganization has developed exclusively out of the marriage situation. Here the individual has been able to cope with his problems in the past but finds himself unable to adjust to his marriage partner. In other cases, however, marriage relations constitute simply an additional conflict situation in the life of the individual with which he is unable to cope.

Thus, the recognition of domestic discord as growing out of the disorganization of the personality leads to greater emphasis upon the personal development and the social experiences of the husband and wife. With the realization of the continuity between the early life of the individual and marriage relations, greater attention is required in understanding the development of personality. This information is important not only because it throws light upon the origin of domestic discord, but also because it reveals the basic mechanisms in the personality pattern of the individual, a process essential to successful treatment of the situation. The social therapist is always working on the assumption that the pattern of domestic discord is inextricably interwoven with the personality pattern. Before treatment is attempted, therefore, it is necessary to understand the sequence of events in the individual's life process which culminates in the domestic-discord situation.

Even in those cases where conflict has grown out of the marriage, it is necessary to go into the personality of the individuals concerned. Before attempting treatment it is quite essential to get at the genesis of the attitudes which enter into the patterns of sex, response, and cultural conflict even if these are not intertwined with disorganizing trends.

Successful treatment consists then in working out adjustments in the attitudes of husband and wife. This is accomplished by introducing elements into the situation which, either because of their relationship to the mechanisms discovered or because of their connection with the early experience of the individual, change its significance and meaning so that the conflict is modified or dissolved. Fundamentally, treatment becomes a process of changing through socio-psychic therapy those attitudes constituting the basic conflict pattern. In some cases this means a reorganization of the personality. In other cases it involves facilitating the process of adjustment, which goes on unaided in some cases but is delayed or impeded in others.

Treatment, however, is not a haphazard and opportunistic affair dealing with what is observed on the surface. Instead, the social therapist must take into account both the covert and overt processes with particular emphasis upon the symbolic connections between the two. This involves the use of a highly skilled technique designed not only to disclose the connections between the elements making for conflict but also to facilitate discovery of the covert processes.

In view of the fact that this understanding of the relationship between elements is not inevitably secured, as past experience has shown, the selection of a method of research is of utmost importance. How the clinical method utilized in this study meets this demand and at the same time differs from other procedures may be seen by contrast with the more recent contemporary studies in this field.

Dr. Katharine B. Davis in her study, *Factors in the Sex Life of Twenty-Two Hundred Women* (1929), used the anonymous questionnaire method. Two groups were studied: about one thousand educated married women and a thousand unmarried college women. The purpose of the study was to obtain more adequate data on the physical and mental facts of the sex life of the normal woman, upon which to base educational programs. Since this was primarily a study of sex factors in the lives of women rather than in marriage alone, only a relatively small number of questions were used which exclusively applied

to married women. Out of the one thousand married women only forty-six said that they were unhappily married.¹ Consequently, few facts were obtained to show the relationship between sex factors and successful married life.

In attempting to determine through the questionnaire what factors make for happiness in marriage, one is dependent, of course, upon the extent to which the person answering the questions is capable of diagnosing his own situation, quite as much as upon the accuracy and integrity of the replies. The result is invariably a series of statements lacking in continuity and revealing only selected aspects of overt behavior.

Combining the questionnaire and the interview, Dr. G. V. Hamilton² developed a method of research for the study of the causes of unhappiness in married life. Hoping to overcome the influence of leading questions and at the same time to facilitate the patient in his response, Dr. Hamilton worked out a procedure which he thought embodied the most desirable aspects of both the questionnaire and the interview approach. In general his method consisted in having each question printed on a separate card in order to eliminate all subjective factors with reference to the questioning process. These cards were presented to the individual one at a time by the investigator who might, if necessary, explain the meaning of the question. The chief function of the investigator was to record the replies of the individual to the printed questions and thus eliminate any difficulty which he might have in putting his answers in writing. Furthermore, the use of a standard set of cards in each instance was designed to counteract any tendency on the part of the investigator to vary the questions either in number, in sequence, or in phraseology, thus insuring comparability in all replies.³

The persons studied by Dr. Hamilton were first "a few generous volunteers" persuaded by a friend to offer themselves for

¹Seventy others answered, "Fairly, more or less, not all together." See Davis, *Factors in the Sex Life of Twenty-Two Hundred Women*. p. 11.

²*A Research in Marriage* (1929).

³This was done in response to criticism of the psychoanalytic method. Dr. Hamilton hoped by his method to reduce the personal equation and thus insure the objectivity of the data obtained. (See Hamilton, *A Research in Marriage*, pp. 5-9.)

research study. These in turn solicited their friends. The result was that Dr. Hamilton had no difficulty in obtaining the two hundred subjects. However, of this group of two hundred married persons, there were only fifty-five who were married mates. No attempt was made to study these fifty-five couples apart from the rest of the group.

Again, while this procedure undoubtedly made for greater fullness in replies, there is no indication that it overcame the two chief deficiencies of the questionnaire method, namely, its neglect of covert processes and its failure to give a unified representation of the attitudes of the person. The result was that the replies of a particular person are lost in the anonymous statistical presentation.

Dickinson and Beam's study, *A Thousand Marriages* (1931), consists primarily of sex case histories of women patients taken down by a gynecologist. The average patient was treated and watched by Dr. Dickinson over a period of seven years. While the material recorded followed a medical routine, some of it had a "highly personal setting" and was given at the time of emotional crises.

Dr. Dickinson's method may be characterized as the personal interview. The study differs from Dr. Davis' and from Dr. Hamilton's in that it was based upon clinical materials gathered in the course of practice rather than as a part of a research project. The result was that, whereas Dr. Dickinson followed a routine procedure with reference to the gynecological examination, there was no uniform interviewing upon the psychological and social problems involved in sexual adjustment. Consequently, certain points were stressed in some records which were either given less emphasis or completely ignored in others.

Significant material bearing upon sexual adjustment is presented by Dr. Dickinson in the person's own words. This adds not only to the realism of his case materials but reveals more vividly the attitudes of the patients toward sex than do the records restricted exclusively to characterizations on the part of the interviewer.

The studies previously described deal primarily with the

analysis of sex factors. *Domestic Discord*¹ (1928), based upon a study of domestic-discord records of social agencies, takes cognizance of factors other than sex. An attempt was made to determine and evaluate the diagnostic and treatment techniques used by social workers in connection with the problems of domestic discord. This study is chiefly of a critical nature and not only serves the purpose of describing the current processes in handling problems involving conflict between husband and wife but also suggests the need for research in treatment techniques and a method of procedure. Thus in *Domestic Discord* the emphasis is chiefly upon a plea for the clinical approach as a substitute for current processes of diagnosis and treatment.

The clinical approach used in the present study has more in common with the method of Dr. Dickinson than with those of the other studies already discussed. This is due in part to the use of the personal interview method by both Dr. Dickinson and the writer. A further resemblance grows out of the fact that both were concerned with securing data upon which to base treatment. It should be kept in mind, however, that Dr. Dickinson was primarily concerned with treatment of the medical aspects of sexual adjustment. While he recognized the larger problem of conflict in marriage relations, this was treated incidentally to that of sexual maladjustment, in which he as a physician was naturally more interested.

The personal interview method was not used by Dr. Hamilton because he wished to insure comparability in the responses which he secured. He attempted to do this by standardizing his procedure through the use of printed questions and through control of the office setting, even to the extent of tying the subject's chair to the wall to prevent its being moved closer to the investigator. The objection may be raised, however, that questions presented in this manner insure standardization only in mechanics. From the standpoint of the psychological setting what assurance has one that the situations in all cases were identical upon reaching a particular point in the sequence of questions? The problem is further complicated by the fact that Dr.

¹By Ernest R. Mowrer with the collaboration of Harriet R. Mowrer.

Hamilton's contact with each subject varied from two to thirty hours. These periods were not continuous but were broken up into sessions usually not more than two hours in length. Consequently, the points at which interviews were broken off and resumed were not identical from case to case.

Furthermore, standardization in phraseology of questions does not mean a standardization of meaning. Dr. Hamilton recognized this since he allowed himself the privilege of explaining or elaborating upon the questions where there was any indication of misunderstanding.

While Dr. Hamilton's method achieves a higher degree of standardization in some respects than in others, there are no doubt purposes to which his technique is highly appropriate. Experimental variation of interviewing procedure is desirable in the development of techniques appropriate to particular requirements. Each method, however, is likely to have certain values as well as certain limitations depending upon the purposes for which it is used and the kind of materials it is designed to secure.¹

Accordingly, the clinical interview will naturally develop its own technique adapted to the requirements of the situation. These requirements have to do chiefly with getting at the social-psychological patterns in domestic-discord cases, which will furnish a basis for treatment.

The clinical interview as employed in this study can in competent hands yield comparable results, assuming that the interviewer has already formulated quite clearly in his own mind the essential nature of the situation under investigation. The same questions are asked, therefore, in every case but not necessarily in the same time sequence nor in identical phraseology. Instead the psychological sequence governs the order of questions. In

¹This wide variation in the technique of interviewing is discussed at length in Bingham and Moore, *How to Interview* (1931). These writers deal exclusively with the fact-finding interview, as used in the fields of industry, education, social case work, psychiatry, journalism, law, and applied psychology.

Discussion of the case-work interview is to be found in American Association of Social Work (Chicago Chapter, "Committee on Interviews"), *Interviews: A Study of the Methods of Analyzing and Recording Social Case Work Interviews* (1928). See also Mowrer, Ernest R., and Harriet R., *Domestic Discord*, pp. 53-64.

turn the phraseology is experimentally adapted to the vocabulary and mental framework of the patient. In this way the social-psychological setting may be more highly standardized than is possible through any degree of mechanical manipulation.

In the clinical interview there is assumed an organic unity between factors, an element which is lost in the use of the questionnaire. Sex, for example, is not thought of in abstraction from the other factors involved in the conflict in marriage. On the contrary, it gets its meaning and significance out of its relationship with these other factors. Of particular interest is the way in which sex becomes symbolized in other phases of the marriage relationship. It is only by analyzing the whole complex of factors involved that domestic-discord problems may be understood and successfully treated.

Thus the organic unity of behavior is preserved in the clinical approach through the fact that the interviewer is in a position to analyze the data as the interview progresses. This analysis in turn gives direction to the interviewing process. Connections between elements are discovered, therefore, which could probably never be found in the use of any stereotyped sequence. The result is to facilitate both the analysis of the interview and the treatment process which is to follow.

•

CHAPTER II

THE INTERVIEW

The clinical interview as used in this study of domestic discord cases has a two-fold purpose to perform. Its first purpose is to obtain sufficient data from the husband and from the wife for an analysis of the case upon the basis of which recommendations for treatment may be made. The adequacy of this analysis, then, is largely dependent upon the skill of the interviewer in eliciting all the data necessary for the clear understanding of the genesis and growth of the marital conflict.

The highly skilled interviewer facilitates the patient in telling of his experiences and conflicts which ordinarily he would find difficult if not impossible to verbalize. The implication is, of course, that it may be possible in one interview with each person, i.e., the husband and wife, to obtain the necessary data if the technique is clearly defined.

The second purpose of the clinical interview is to initiate a treatment process, which in the nature of the situation the patient has a right to expect. Again the ability of the interviewer determines whether or not the interpretation of the situation is accepted by the patient. This acceptance is the first crucial step in the treatment process.

Success in the interview is the result not only of careful planning in advance, but also of direction during the course of the interview. Of first importance, therefore, is the assurance that the interview is held under such physical conditions as will facilitate rather than impede the process.

The interview is held in the office by appointment. There are several reasons for this arrangement. Office interviews by appointment help to establish a professional relationship be-

tween the patient and the interviewer. Furthermore, since the interview requires at least four hours it is quite essential to arrange for sufficient time free from interruption.

The initial interview may be with either the husband or the wife, depending upon the emergency aspects of the situation; e.g., if the husband is threatening to leave, he is seen first, or if a wife is in a highly emotional state she may be given the earlier appointment. But regardless of who is seen first, each is interviewed separately and privately. To interview both together is not only to furnish an opportunity for innumerable charges and counter charges on the part of both husband and wife but to become a participant in the family quarrel. Even should the interviewer be able completely to control the situation he could not obtain the data necessary upon which to base an analysis. Data pertaining to the early life and experiences of the individual are highly confidential in nature and can not in a great majority of cases be secured in the presence of a third person.

Another essential aspect of the interviewing process is the conceptual background which determines the nature of the questions asked. That is to say, what one gets in the interview depends upon what the interviewer considers to be essential data, not only in regard to family relations in general but also as to the nature of significant variations from these.

This implies that one has an outline which serves as a guide for securing the desired data. This outline is determined by one's conception of the nature of family relations which in turn implies a conception of human nature, and of the nature of the interaction between human beings. While such an outline serves simply as a tool, it is as essential to the interview as is the blueprint to the construction of a building. But obviously blueprints vary with the conception of the sort of building one wants to build. This does not mean that one's outline is a stereotyped set of questions. It does, however, serve as a guide to facilitate the securing of material upon which one will later base his analysis and treatment.

The function of the outline, therefore, is something more than simply to suggest questions to be asked. In fact, its chief

function is to define the relationship between the elements in order to insure that the material secured will fit into a co-ordinated pattern. Since the outline has been constructed with this co-ordination in mind, it is essential that this sequence be followed in the interview, rather than subsequently fitting the materials artificially into the outline.

The approach to the interview is important in determining whether or not the interviewer will be successful in securing the desired material. Every interview is opened with a handshake and greeting and invitation to have a chair and to remove any wraps interfering with comfort. This takes but a minute. The patient is always met at the door, and the interviewer takes his place behind his desk after the patient has seated himself. This approach, while informal in nature, does not prevent the establishment of a professional relationship and serves the purpose of putting the patient at ease. Furthermore it tends to disarm the antagonistic husband who arrives at the office excited and angry because he believes that his wife has unjustly complained against him.

It is necessary to write down verbatim a complete account of what the patient tells. A knowledge of shorthand is a great asset, otherwise it is necessary for the interviewer to devise his own system of abbreviations. Taking down the interview should be done as quietly and inconspicuously as possible. It is desirable to use a small pencil and small pieces of paper which have been torn from a pad prior to the appearance of the patient. Otherwise attention may be called to the fact that the interviewer is looking for a pencil or getting paper ready to take down a history.

Two methods of initiating note taking have been experimented with by the writer. The patient has been asked if he had any objection to the interviewer taking notes. In this case it was explained that it would obviously be impossible to remember all that the patient will tell him and in order to prevent any confusion of his situation with that of any one else, it will be necessary to write down his account. To this the patient has always assured the interviewer that he has no objections. At

other times no explanation has been given and the patient has seemed quite unaware that notes were being taken. This is probably due to the fact that at the outset of the interview no notes are taken, since the interviewer is explaining its purpose. Consequently, note taking begins gradually with reference to questions which give identifying information to which no one would object. As the interview progresses, the patient loses himself completely in the details of his story so that he is not conscious of what the interviewer is doing other than aiding him to verbalize his experiences.

Below is an illustration which shows the general approach used in opening an interview. This does not mean that it is always opened in just this way. It does, however, indicate the general form, and in one particular instance the exact wording used by the writer:

"I understand that you have been having some domestic trouble. I handle only situations where there is difficulty between husband and wife. I go into the situation very thoroughly. You know when you are sick you go to a doctor, and if you have heart trouble, for example, you need a heart specialist. The same thing is true here. You have domestic troubles. Then you need to go to someone who specializes in that and who can analyze your situation and recommend treatment.

"You know it has probably taken years for the present situation to develop, so after all it is rather complicated and needs to be gone into thoroughly. Let's see, how long has it been?

"You want me to go into it thoroughly, don't you? To do so, I will have to ask you a lot of questions which may at first seem to you—well, a bit foolish. By foolish I mean you may think they are far-fetched and have nothing to do with the present, but I have found in talking with a great number of people about their domestic troubles that these questions are very important. You know, when you go to a doctor with a serious ailment, and he gives you a thorough physical examination, he asks you questions which seem to have no connection with your present sickness, such as, 'Have you ever had the whooping cough, measles, or scarlet fever when you were a child?' Isn't that true?

"So I hope you won't mind my asking you these questions. (At this point the patient usually says, 'Why should I mind? I want to tell everything. I see you understand.')

"Another thing—you know I really want to get at the difficulty between you and your wife, but I am not interested in fixing the blame on either of you, because I have usually found that people aren't to blame. All of us oftentimes think we are doing the right thing and it turns out to be the wrong one, and so many times we just kid ourselves. You know what I mean. So I want you to feel perfectly at ease and tell me everything.

"How long have you been in this country? Let's see, you are about thirty-five or thirty-eight. You were just a young man when you came. I suppose you left brothers and sisters behind you in Europe." (Instead of direct questioning such as, "How old are you? How old were you when you came here? Did you have brothers and sisters?")

"Yes, but I had a brother and sister already here. They sent for me."

"You must have been the youngest of the family then."

"How did you know that?"

(These statements are interpretations or guesses. It does not mean that the information is had in advance, nor that the statements are made with such finality as to prevent the patient modifying them should they be partially inaccurate. The ability to make such predictions, of course, comes from long experience with similar cases and the recognition of correlated factors.)

"You know families differ a lot. Some feel very close to each other and others go their own way. Was your family happy together, or did your mother and father have trouble?"

"My mother and father were not rich, but they were always living nice. My father was a religious man and stayed all the time by the Bible. My mother always made the living. She was the man of the family."

"You were fond of your mother then?"

"Oh yes, I would have given my life for my mother."

"You preferred her to your father, then? That is interesting. You know it has been said that boys usually do prefer their mothers and girls like their fathers best."

"My mother had more feeling and was more dependable. My father was more like a minister. The older sister was more like the mother."

"Is your mother living?"

"No, if she would be living, things would be different now." (Here the interviewer met with an emotional attachment which was a considerable asset in the treatment of the situation, as will be pointed out later.)

"It was hard to get an education in Europe, wasn't it? Were you able to go to school there at all?" . . .

"I expect you had a hard time when you came over as an immigrant!"

"I should say I did. I worked for \$6.00 a week." . . .

Having established rapport through the initial steps of the interview, the interviewer follows a sequence of questions predetermined by his conception of what constitutes essential data. This does not mean, however, that one has before him a printed list of questions. It is essential that the general outline be in the mind of the interviewer rather than in printed or typewritten form. Otherwise there will not be the flexibility which is required from case to case.

As the interview progresses and the nature of the conflict becomes evident, the interviewer adds additional questions which serve to confirm or disprove certain hypotheses. These hypotheses are constantly being formulated throughout the interview and serve accordingly as a guide to the questioning. Thus the interviewer must continually analyze the interview as it progresses, asking those additional questions which make it more pertinent to the type of case with which he is dealing.

This elaboration upon the general outline is much more full in the case of the second person interviewed than with the first. This is due, of course, to the fact that the interviewer is able to utilize in the subsequent analysis the facts obtained from the interview with the first person.

Since the elaboration upon certain points is guided by the analysis as the interview progresses, it is difficult to tell another person how to conduct a successful interview. No matter how carefully planned the interview may be as regards the general pattern, it must necessarily allow for a wide range of variation in detail.

The outline which follows, accordingly, indicates only the general pattern. It also shows the order in which the interview is conducted and the general type of questions asked both husband and wife. The phraseology, however, is entirely different from that used in the actual questioning, as will be seen later.

FAMILY ORGANIZATION

1. What was the status of each in his respective early family group? Rank and order of birth in family—oldest, youngest, etc.
2. What role did he assume—mother's favorite? Pampered? Ignored? Inferior? Why?
3. What early type of adjustment did he make?
4. Did he have an inferior role, but the desire to play the superior role?
Did he feel that only his mother or sister understood him? Attitude toward his father.
5. Was he jealous of any member of his family?
6. What was his family pattern—the detached or the cohesive?
7. What type of family organization was represented in each, i.e.,
(a) emancipated, (b) paternal, (c) maternal, (d) filio-centric?
8. How was discipline maintained?
9. To what degree was the family disorganized?
10. Did he endeavor to attract attention?
11. Was he lonely and did he feel no one understood him?
12. What were the conflicting conceptions of family life with which he came in contact?
13. Were there any cases of domestic discord in immediate family or relatives' families?

CULTURAL PATTERNS

1. To what economic classes did the parents of each belong?
2. What formal education did each have?
3. What kind of work had each done prior to marriage?
4. What were the educational, intellectual, social, political, and religious interests of each prior to marriage?
5. Has there been conflict between what he would like to do and what he has had to do?

SOCIAL INTERACTION

A. *Factors in Adjustment and Conflict between Family and Community*

1. Economic

- (a) How does the family make a living?
- (b) A detailed account of husband's work and economic adjustment.
- (c) What economic crises have been encountered from time to time?
- (d) How have adjustments been made?
- (e) What pathological forms of behavior have resulted from economic conflict between the family and the community?
- (f) Attitude toward work. Does he feel the world owes him a living, etc.?

2. Health

- (a) Has any member of the family a communicable disease? Ever had?
- (b) Have they any life insurance? Accident insurance?
- (c) Is any member in ill-health? Crippled?
- (d) Contacts with health agencies and physicians. Attitude.

3. Sex

- (a) Have any of the members been sexually delinquent, either before or after marriage?
- (b) What are the current sex attitudes in the neighborhood and do these coincide with those in the family?

4. Cultural

- (a) What, if any, have been the chief cultural crises in adjustment? How did these affect the attitude of the family?
- (b) With what cultural interests are the members of the family identified?
- (c) Is the family a party to any religious or racial conflicts either within the immediate neighborhood or within the large family group?

- (d) Was there any opposition to this marriage? Of what nature? How was adjustment made to it?

5. Pattern of Life

- (a) What philosophy of life characterizes the attempts at adjustment of each member to the community? Idealistic? Get-by attitude? "World owes me a living" attitude, etc.?
- (b) Has his life organization followed a consistent pattern, or has he inconsistently endeavored to realize his individual possibilities?
- (c) Has he, when he failed to get himself across in a straightforward manner, resorted to subterfuge?

B. *Factors in Adjustment and Conflict within Family Group*

1. Economic

- (a) What economic role does each member of the family play?
- (b) Does this represent an adjustment or a truce?
- (c) How did the present situation develop?
- (d) Do husband and wife discuss business and finances?

2. Health

- (a) What health factors make for discord between members of the family?
- (b) What role has health played in determining the pattern of family organization?
- (c) Have complaints of ill health been used as a means of escape from difficult situations?

3. Sex

- (a) Knowledge of sex at time of marriage. Any sex shock prior to marriage?
- (b) What has been the frequency of sexual relations? Trace from beginning of marriage to present. Attitudes of both.
- (c) What has been and is the reaction of the wife toward this experience? (Trace.)
- (d) How soon after marriage did intercourse occur? Reactions to this experience in detail.
- (e) How has conflict developed?
- (f) Does husband reach climax quickly?
- (g) Does wife have an orgasm?
- (h) Practice of perversions? How were they started?
- (i) Attitude toward children.
- (j) Any attempt to prevent conception? What?
- (k) Are husband and wife satisfied in their sexual relations?
- (l) What is known of physiology of the sex act?
- (m) Attitudes arising out of sex conflict (inferiority, etc.).

- (n) Abortions and miscarriages. Attitude.
- (o) Was childbirth difficult? Attitude toward childbirth.
- 4. Cultural Factors
 - (a) How do husband and wife differ culturally?
 - (b) In what way has this caused discord?
 - (c) Do husband and wife go out together?
 - (d) Do husband and wife eat together?
 - (e) Feeling of superiority.
 - (f) Have there been any attempts to adjust cultural differences?
 - (g) How do they succeed or fail and why?
 - (h) Do the children participate in any way in this conflict?
- 5. Pattern of Life
 - (a) How would you characterize the differences in pattern of life of husband and wife ? Of children?
 - (b) How does the philosophy of life of each with regard to family relations differ from that with regard to neighborhood or other contacts?

RATIONALIZATIONS

[There is a tendency for domestic conflict to become organized around certain symbolic factors: (a) those having group approval (b) those used to square one's own conscience.]

1. What points always create friction and misunderstanding?
2. What does each consider to be the fundamental difficulty or obstacle to adjustment?
3. How does each explain why he has failed in marriage?
4. How has the conception of marriage relations of each changed?
5. What were the early ambitions and enthusiasms of each and how did they change?
6. How do they account for this change?
7. What were the circumstances leading up to the separation or crisis situation?
8. If each could live his life over again how would he want it to be different?
9. Does couple wish to separate? Why? What are their plans?
10. How would each feel if he were told the other had died?

Success by the interviewer in securing material from the patient is facilitated further by the use of certain devices. One of these devices is lack of contentiousness. That is, no direct effort is made at verification. For example, the husband is not told,

"Your wife says that you do not give her an allowance, is that true?" or, "Is it true that you are not having sex relations?" To attempt verification in this manner would mean that either one or both persons would be antagonized. Furthermore, with such an implied premium placed upon conformity with current standards the answer probably would be falsified.

The check, then, is internal rather than external, i.e., the check lies in the consistency of the story. For example, take the case of a wife who in telling of her early life has brought out the fact that she as the youngest girl in her family was sheltered and given no sex instruction. She had few friends and was self-centered. Marriage to her was a romantic adventure. At this point in the interview if she should say that first intercourse was a pleasant experience accompanied by no conflict, this part of her story would be inconsistent with that which had preceded.

Neither is the husband told what the wife has told the interviewer. When a husband says, for example, "What did my wife say?" the reply of the interviewer is, "It is my policy never to tell either party what the other has said. If I do so, I become a gossip carrying information from one person to another. You wouldn't want me to do that, would you?"

It is true, of course, that the interviewer often takes advantage of the facts which she has found out from the other person but this is done indirectly. How this is accomplished may be illustrated in a case where the wife had told the interviewer that her husband was a professional gambler. Instead of making any reference to this, questions were directed toward certain sequences in his economic adjustment. When a certain point in this history was reached and an abrupt change was indicated, he said, "I might as well tell you, I am a professional gambler."

A further element in contributing to the effectiveness of the interview is the control exercised on the part of the interviewer. The interview is directed at every point and at no time is the patient allowed to follow his own lead. To permit the patient to ramble would be to admit a great deal of irrelevant material solely concerned with overt behavior.

While control is never lost, it is not apparent on the surface.

The person is given all the time he needs to answer a question and he seems to be allowed to follow his own impulses in regard to what he talks about, but actually the interview is highly controlled. This may be illustrated by what happened in one interview when the interviewer said to the husband, "I suppose you have other women." The man began an exposition of will power as differentiating between human beings and animals. At this point the interviewer granted this difference but said that while human beings have a high degree of control—as he had pointed out—there were situations in which the husband did have relations with other women. The interviewer then added, "I suppose that is true in your situation," which he readily admitted. Control, therefore, is secured not by abruptly determining what the person is to talk about, but rather by so redefining what he says that he does not realize that he is doing anything other than following his own impulses.

The way in which questions are phrased is also an important aspect of interviewing. Questions are always asked indirectly. Instead of asking, for example, "Are you the youngest?" or "Were you the youngest or oldest?" it is better to say, "I suppose you left brothers and sisters behind you in Europe." If the reply is in the affirmative, this is followed by the further remark, "You must have been the oldest."

Every opportunity is given to make the patient feel that he is not being quizzed but is simply being aided in telling his story. It might seem upon first thought that the patient was being influenced, whereas the facts are that every precaution is taken to prevent anything of the kind. This is accomplished by tone of voice, lack of contentiousness, and absence of aggressiveness. The interviewer is so completely in the background that the only influence upon the patient is to facilitate his expression.

Questions are also phrased, particularly in the beginning of the interview, in such a way as to indicate that they have no moral significance. For example, "It was hard to get an education in Europe. Were you able to go to school?" There is no point here for the person to falsify his educational achievements, because there is nothing in the interviewer's attitude to indi-

cate that a premium is placed upon education. It is true that it has been difficult and often impossible for many persons in Europe to go to school.

In certain cases where the person is rather resistant, questions phrased so as to characterize a situation about which the interviewer has had no previous knowledge tend to break down resistance and enhance the interviewer's prestige. Thus in a case where the husband's attitude was in the beginning a combination of sullenness and cocksureness, the following observation was made, "You are the youngest of the family, aren't you? Then you must have been the favorite and spoiled."

In this instance, the person's behavior is analyzed to him. If he is antagonistic he may be told, "When you came, you expected to be blamed and told what to do. I could tell that by the way you came into the room. I understand that very well. That is the reason why you act a little bit cocky at times. That is natural, of course, but you really are not that kind of person underneath. You are just kidding yourself, aren't you?"

Not infrequently, however, what appears on the surface as resistance may actually represent nothing more than a natural reticence in talking about certain things of which the patient is ashamed. Under these circumstances hypothetical situations may be set up as a way of asking indirect questions. The patient may be asked how he would react in a certain situation. He usually gives such an explanation and then adds, "I know I would because I have." This furnishes the cue for further questioning upon a subject which the patient seems to have introduced himself.

Care needs to be exercised in following a sequence of questions in the interview which facilitates securing the information desired. Questions are first asked about the individual's early life. This is the normal order which enables one to get a life sequence upon which to base an analysis. Any other sequence would fail to reveal the genetic development of attitudes and of personality trends.

In beginning the interview with the early life of the individual, reserve is always broken down immediately by discus-

sion of early emotional attachments, early ambitions, etc. One is able to take a more detached and objective point of view toward his early life than toward his immediate conflict situation. Thus the interviewer is able to get the individual to transfer this objectivity to the more immediate situation, when that point is reached in the sequence. Otherwise, if the individual were first allowed to discuss the current elements of the conflict, the result would be a series of accusations representing an outlet to pent-up emotions but which furnish little or no significant data.

Early avoidance of reference to the conflict situation has an added advantage in the interview with the husband. It is quite natural for a husband whose wife has complained against him to come to the office expecting to be blamed and to be told what to do and what not to do. He anticipates a discussion of the immediate conflict situation. He may even have turned over in his mind the possible questions that might be asked him. He tends to build up a defense in terms of his anticipations. To find, therefore, that the interviewer has a totally different approach disarms him and, in dissolving his antagonism, creates in him a receptive mood.

Another advantage of starting with the early life of the patient is that through the process of transference the interviewer becomes identified with the individual's past which is more pleasant because it is a memory. On the other hand, if the interviewer starts with the present, he immediately becomes identified with the conflict situation. Furthermore, incidents of the past which have an emotional tone can be used as a transference to other points in the interview.

How an emotional attachment discovered in the interview can be utilized to advantage may be illustrated in the case of a man who had recently lost his mother, of whom he was very fond. In discussing certain other subjects he showed a great lack of seriousness. Before and during the process of obtaining detailed sex material this tendency toward flippancy was dealt with through references made to his mother in such a way as to transfer a serious tone to this part of the interview. Thus, for example, instead of asking, "I suppose you knew something of

sex before your marriage?" the question was phrased, "I suppose your mother talked to you about sex when you were a boy?"

The chronological sequence is of further advantage because it follows the natural order of treatment. It enables the individual to see for the first time his life processes as a whole as well as the events culminating in domestic discord, and this constitutes the first essential step in treatment. Through following this sequence one avoids the tendency for the present antagonisms to provide the emotional setting for the portrayal of the genesis of attitudes and thus obtains a higher degree of objectivity than would otherwise be possible.

The question may be raised as to whether it is always possible to control the interview when starting with questions pertaining to the early life, since the patient may become restless and wish to plunge ahead to his immediate problem. Should this occur, it reveals the interviewer's lack of mastery of the technique rather than any defect in the procedure itself. Most individuals are sufficiently interested in the genetic development of their own personalities to patiently follow through the sequence if it is made realistic and intelligible to them. The problem of coping with the patient's restlessness, therefore, does not arise because the individual becomes so absorbed in his story that he loses himself completely in it. Even women who have said at the outset that because of "nervousness" they lack patience and ability to sit still long enough to perform certain tasks become so absorbed in the interview as to sit patiently and quietly for four or five hours.

Should the patient at first, however, show an inclination to forge ahead, it is not difficult to counteract this tendency. A remark such as the following is usually sufficient: "We will come to your domestic troubles later. You see, you haven't even met your wife yet. According to the story you are still a little boy back in your own family. Let's see, you said you were very much attached to your sister." Thus the individual is expeditiously brought back to the original point in the sequence with the re-establishment of the previous setting.

Another aspect of the sequence in which questions are asked

has to do with the obtaining of sex data. While an entirely new technique is not required, the use of a number of rather well-defined variations has been found advantageous. The purpose of these variations is, of course, to break down the natural reticence which has resulted from the widespread taboo upon the subject of sex so that the patient may talk with little or no conflict. It is true, of course, that by the time the discussion of sex is reached in the sequence the patient has become convinced of the interviewer's objectivity and therefore feels much less hesitancy in talking freely than would ordinarily be true.

The discussion of sex with the patient is usually taken up just following the health situation. This seems to the patient to be a logical transition consistent with the professional atmosphere throughout the interview. There have been some slight variations in this procedure. For instance, in a difficult situation the discussion of a man's hobby just before the sex question was approached proved advantageous. In discussing his hobby he talked with ease and assurance. It was a simple matter, accordingly, to transfer this ease and straightforwardness to his sex life, and thereby obtain a frank statement.

Phrasing of the questions pertaining to sex is of paramount importance and probably determines more than anything else the authenticity of the material secured. Questions asked indirectly allow the patient to discuss his sex adjustment with as little conflict as possible because they do not indicate social disapproval and therefore counteract feelings of shame by providing a non-moral setting for the patient's replies. In this way no premium is placed upon answers showing social conformity and the patient is encouraged to talk about his sex experiences in the same rational way he would tell about his health or the kind of work he has done.

The husband is never asked, "Do you go to other women?" It is assumed, however, that in certain situations the probabilities are that the man has relations with other women. The question is therefore phrased in terms of this probability but at the same time with such explanation as will facilitate a reply: "I find that in a number of situations where there is conflict be-

tween husband and wife that the husband goes to other women. I suppose that is what happened in your case."

In this way the patient is assisted in telling something which he finds difficult to say, with the result that his answer frequently provides a further opening, such as: "Yes, I have been no angel. My wife didn't want to stay with me. I see you understand. Now I am going to tell you everything. That's the trouble." Thus the interviewer has maneuvered himself into a position to go into every phase of sex relations with the assurance that the patient will co-operate in every respect. The second stage in the questioning about sex is therefore introduced with some such statement as: "I have found in a large number of cases that there is a great deal of sex conflict. Let's start at the beginning of your marriage now and see if we can get at the bottom of the trouble. Let's start with the first night."

Here as elsewhere the check upon the accuracy of sex data lies in the consistency of the story. The interviewer must, therefore, continually analyze the data as a basis for testing its consistency but also for the purpose of determining the most appropriate way in which to phrase further questions. Where the sequences already discovered seem to indicate the probability of certain consequences, these probabilities are assumed in the phrasing of the questions. Should the answer be contrary to expectations, it indicates either a reluctance at the moment to go into the matter or else calls for a changed line of questioning designed to achieve consistency in the story. Since whatever assumptions are made are usually contrary to social demands, an answer in the affirmative, of course, requires no further check.¹

Furthermore, questions are phrased in such a way as to elicit concrete and specific data rather than general responses. Thus the patient is not asked, "Do you enjoy sex relations with your marriage partner?" or "Do you get along sexually?" Instead a detailed description of sex relations is obtained which reveals

¹The writer has never found a case where, following the procedure outlined, the husband and wife have given conflicting sex data, even when the account involved telling of perversions, except that sometimes the husband has told of going to other women where his wife has doubted that he has had such relations.

whether or not these relations are pleasant or unpleasant, whereas the general question will frequently result in an affirmative answer in situations where the details indicate otherwise.

Because many women seem at first to be more hesitant than men in discussing sex, it has frequently seemed advisable to give them a logical explanation of why they may feel some reticence in talking about the subject. Women, accordingly, are told something like this: "I want to talk to you about your living together as man and wife. I have found that in a large number of situations there is trouble about this. It is something no one need be ashamed of. It is natural. If you weren't that way, i.e., if you sometimes didn't want it, then that wouldn't be natural. You see women in the past haven't understood so much about sex and living together as man and wife as your children will understand. Let's see, I don't suppose you knew a great deal about what it meant to be married—or did you?"

Reticence in discussing sex is, of course, frequently a reflection of the attitude of the interviewer. The interviewer, therefore, must approach the subject of sex without timidity and with frankness. He must also talk in a language which the patient can understand. This means a flexibility in vocabulary developed out of experience with different types of patients. For example, to many patients the word "relations" may have no connection with sex, but be interpreted instead as referring to their "relatives"; whereas in other cases the term furnishes quite an appropriate substitute for the more bald expression, "intercourse."

Since the vocabulary of the patient is often inadequate for his needs, it is necessary that the interviewer have a sufficiently wide knowledge of sex to be able to assist the patient in verbalization. Here it is necessary to guard against misinterpretation or any indication of embarrassment at the crudeness of expression. Neither is there any need to apologize for having asked questions of such a personal nature, since to do so would belie the matter-of-fact approach which has preceded.

The interview is terminated by giving the patient an analysis or interpretation of the situation in as simple and clear terms

as possible. This is done in an attempt to get him to take a more objective attitude toward his difficulties. The analysis is purely objective and not in terms of praise or blame. This analysis is what has been promised him at the beginning of the interview. Using the sequence indicated, it is not difficult by the time the close of the interview is reached to give the patient an objective view.

In the case of the first person interviewed, this interpretation is less complete and centers around factors in the individual's life prior to marriage and their effect upon attitudes in marriage. In order to complete the analysis in terms of both the marriage partners, it is necessary for the first person interviewed to return for a second interview. In the case of the second person interviewed, however, it is possible to give him a complete analysis of both his own behavior and that of his marriage partner, at the time of the first interview. The process by which the patient is brought to accept this analysis constitutes a phase of treatment and is discussed in detail in Chapter XIII.

It is usually well to tell the person how his situation has factors common to other situations. In this way one anticipates any satisfaction the person may experience by having a peculiar kind of discord. Thus the normality of his behavior or situation is emphasized rather than the unusual features even though such should appear.

Further treatment is initiated at this time by telling the patient in a general way of what the treatment program will consist. Where this program is to be carried on by the interviewer this is explained to the patient. Where it is to be delegated to another individual he is told that the analysis in detail along with the recommendations for treatment will be given to this person who will get in touch with him.

It will be observed that in the interview of this sort there is no attempt made to get the patient to perform any overt act. Instead the drive is in the direction of modifying his attitudes relative to his family situation. The patient is not asked or told to do anything. He is told something like this, "I can give you the factors in the situation which have led up to the present

difficulty." These are given to him starting with his early life and coming down to the present. Then the interviewer may go on to say: "It is a situation where neither of you is to blame. I cannot tell you whether you should or should not live with your husband. That is for you to decide. I have given you an idea of the treatment to be carried out. The present difficulty did not arise overnight and it cannot be adjusted overnight. Treatment will require some time. It is up to you to decide if we are going to start and work it through."

The interview is terminated as it is opened, with a handshake.¹ Since the patient becomes so absorbed in the situation, it is necessary that the interviewer end the interview at the appropriate time. This is accomplished in such a way, however, as not to make him feel that he is being suddenly dismissed.

¹The writer has never found a patient who has refused to be interviewed or who has not very willingly remained as long as required.

•

PART TWO

PERSONALITY TYPES AND DOMESTIC DISCORD

CHAPTER III

PERSONALITY ADJUSTMENT AND DOMESTIC DISCORD

Analysis of domestic discord requires an understanding of the nature of marriage and of what that relationship demands in terms of individual adjustment. The ability of the individual to meet these demands, in turn, depends upon his past experiences and the techniques he has developed in the solution of past problem-situations.

Every individual enters marriage with certain potentialities and impediments to adjustment. These "assets" and "liabilities" consist in general of the ideas of the person as to what constitutes marriage, of habit complexes, and of dominant trends in personality. The result is that if two persons marry having opposite or contradictory views or expectations, conflict is inevitable. And since complete resemblance in attitudes and ideas in two persons is never found, some conflict arises in every marriage.)

(To achieve any degree of accord, therefore, some adjustment has to be made to these inevitable conflicts. If the conflict is not too sharp, assuming some degree of plasticity in the persons themselves, they will tend to work out some sort of accommodation.) This accommodation may be of the type in which conflict is repressed in the interest of accord, or it may take the more complete form of solution in which conflict is dissolved and disappears.

(The problem of plasticity is, of course, a complicated one since an individual who is relatively plastic in some respects may be quite unmodifiable in others. Furthermore, disorganization of personality may complicate the situation inasmuch as this condition implies inability of the individual to adjust to

the normal demands of life. Marriage in these cases, because it presents new problem-situations, calls into play mechanisms which are ill-adapted to the demands for accommodation.

Again, the potentialities of adjustment are complicated by the fact that two personalities are always involved, one of which may show a higher or lower degree of plasticity than the other. Consequently, any modification in responses on the part of one individual may offset the absence of modification on the part of the other. Such accommodations, however, are often misleading, since what appears as a modification on the surface may represent repression and therefore find expression indirectly so that the conflict is not dissolved but its overt expression only delayed.)

The normal tendency of individuals in marriage is to try to work out an adjustment to the situation, i.e., to the varying demands of marriage relations from time to time. Since adjustment is never a finished product, marriage requires a continuous series of accommodations and reaccommodations to be successful. This is equivalent to saying that in marriage there is always both accord and discord, though little attention is given to the discord so long as it has its compensations in accord.

It is apparent from what has already been said that the genesis of domestic discord is to be found in those experiences of the individual which have resulted in the fixity of habits and attitudes and in the development of personality trends which halt or impede accommodation. Thus an understanding of the development of personality is essential to the explanation of domestic discord.

Personality may be thought of as consisting of all the various roles of the individual. *Role* refers to that pattern or coordination of attitudes and habits through which the individual secures and maintains status in a particular group. Since an individual belongs to many groups in each of which he plays a different role, his personality is made up of multiple elements.

The various roles, however, are not of equal importance. Every personality tends to be dominated by a minimum number of roles. Ordinarily this means a single role, though in some

instances two roles assume equal importance. This dominant role tends, metaphorically, to exercise the functions of policing, and so to produce some order in what would otherwise be an anarchy of elements.

It is the function of the dominant role, accordingly, to bring into working accord the other roles within the personality. Thus the dominant role tends to make for consistency and unity within the personality by its dynamic direction of accommodation. It is this consistent organization and form of behavior taken by the personality as a resultant of the interaction between the dominant role with the other roles which constitutes the *pattern of life*. But not only is there an attempt to achieve unity for the present, but also throughout the life span of the individual. This results from the fact that accommodations accomplished between the various roles tend to persist and to furnish the basic patterns for future adjustments between roles.

The extent to which unity of purpose and action is achieved in the pattern of life, however, is always a relative matter. To the extent that the personality is adjusted, sufficient co-ordination of roles is accomplished to make for harmonious working together of the various parts of the personality upon a socially approved plane. The personality becomes disorganized, on the other hand, when the form of accommodation between the various roles is such as to interfere with the social adjustment of the individual. But whatever the form of accommodation or life pattern, an adequate analysis requires first an understanding of the genesis of the various roles.

The earliest role of the child is that which he plays in the family group. It is in the family that the child first achieves status and becomes a person. It is to be expected, therefore, that the role of the child in the family would have a far-reaching effect upon the pattern of life of the individual. But what are the factors which determine the role of the child in the family, and how is this role modified by influences outside the family circle?

The child is born into a family situation surcharged with anticipation regarding what he will become. Accordingly, the

moment his sex is determined, he is given a role. This role determines to a large degree the trend in his personality development, i.e., the form which future adjustments will take. If he has the role of the pampered child, for example, catered to by other members and made to feel superior to them, he is likely to come to look upon this position as that to be desired. Later in non-family contacts, he tends to retain this role. In marriage, likewise, he relies upon the same mechanisms developed in the family, except to the extent to which communal contacts have modified these mechanisms.

If, on the other hand, the child is given responsibility and early gains the distinction of being more capable than the other children in his family, he tends to glory in his capability, becoming domineering and critical of others. By the time he marries, this tendency may be so entrenched that he tends to dominate his marriage partner and to expect from him the same recognition of his role as that given in his early family and communal relations.

Should the child's status in the family be inferior, he may accept this position. On the contrary, he may reconstruct his environment more to his own liking, giving himself a more important role through retreat into a dream world or into a world of phantasy. In later life this individual may be thought of as "impractical," or as a misfit. On the other hand, he may, through the development of compensatory mechanisms, achieve a more satisfactory role in the community.

Between the two extremes of the so-called "superior" and "inferior" roles there is a large variety of roles each of which defines not only the way in which the individual relates himself to communal groups but to his marriage partner as well. Each of these has its origin, and to a certain extent becomes crystallized, in the part which the child plays in family interaction.

A number of factors determine the individual's early role or part he will play in his family group. Some of these factors are traditional and arise out of the culture of the group. Under a system of primogeniture, for example, to the oldest son is assigned the most important role among the children in a family.

Here role is transmitted, so to speak, from one generation to another. In the old Hebrew family, the male child was the object of unlimited attention and affection, while the female was given a subordinate role.

In modern American society, however, the youngest child, regardless of sex, tends to be assigned the dominant role. While the first child in a family is for a time the object of much attention, he is soon placed in a less important position with the arrival of a second child who in turn relinquishes his preferred position to the third child, and so on. Closer attachments are more likely to develop with the youngest child because the emotional interdependence between the mother and the last-born is allowed to continue without the inevitable break occasioned by the birth of another child.

Any child in the family, however, regardless of sex or order of birth, may be the recipient of more attention and consideration than that given to the other children. A child may, for example, become the favorite of a parent because of certain earlier family attachments. Thus a mother may show a preference for a particular daughter because her mannerisms or physical characteristics remind the parent of a favorite sister or of her own mother to whom she was greatly attached.

In other instances, a mother may become greatly attached to a son who appears to be more like her father, of whom she was extremely fond, than are any of the other children. It is not uncommon to hear a mother say: "I can't help feeling a different way toward Bob. He grows more like my father every day. I was very close to my father!" In this way the mother defines the role of the child in relation to herself. The child, in turn, tends to live up to this role which not only defines his relations to his mother but to each of the other members of the family.

Antagonisms likewise may grow out of comparable situations where the child is identified with an earlier association which has been unpleasant. Thus a child may be regarded as inferior because he has characteristics which remind members of the family of a relative who was known as "the black sheep of

the family." These characteristics, accordingly, define the role of the child as the counterpart of that played by the relative in the earlier family group.

It is not uncommon also for a parent to identify himself with one child in the family because of characteristics which remind him of himself. Since these characteristics may either resemble traits of which the parent is proud or which he despises in himself, this identification may form the basis for a close attachment or it may arouse antagonism. Thus one finds a mother emphasizing the fact that she has so much in common with a particular daughter:

"I love my oldest daughter. She has such understanding. We have the same thoughts about everything. I was just like her at her age. I am going to do everything for her to see that she gets ahead. I am going to see that she has the opportunities that were denied me. She loves to read. She reads everything she can get her hands on. I am that way. I would rather buy books than food. This girl is brilliant. I am going to do everything to make her successful."

The health of the child also is an important factor in determining his role. If a particular child is delicate, he tends to be catered to and watched over. Accordingly, he holds the center of the stage and soon learns that his lack of robustness can prove an asset in getting special consideration. Even should his physical condition show decided improvement, he may find it advantageous to pretend illness and incapacity in order to secure preferential treatment. It is out of these and similar experiences that the escape-response pattern is developed. (See Chapter VI.)

Close attachments between parent and child, furthermore, develop not infrequently out of the absence of normal family relations. In situations where there is domestic discord the children in the family are usually drawn into the conflict. Either one or both parents tend to single out one child as a confidant. In this way a particular child becomes identified with one parent against the other. This not only tends to make the child a party to the domestic discord but to change his relations

to other children in the family as well, as is illustrated in the following excerpt:

"Robert seems ten years older than his age. He was always the oldest in brains. He was the first to understand me. He is everything I wanted my husband to be. My other son [Philip] is more like a baby and not like a man. He comes to me for advice. Robert is like a man. I feel more like I can depend on him. He is good to me. He adores me. I talk over everything with him. I love him and worship him. He is my life. He is the embodiment of all the good in my father and all I would have liked my husband to be. He is brilliant. I have everything planned for his education. I don't want any girl to come and thwart my ambitions. He is nineteen now but he seems years older. . . .

"The girl [youngest child] tries to attract attention in an abnormal way. She is dull compared to the other children. She wants sympathy and love. She wants to sit with me all the time. She is fond of me. She feels like an outcast in the family.

"Robert disciplines the other children. He does things the way I want them done. He has been that way since he was thirteen years old. I have discussed all the financial problems with him. I ask his advice about everything. I never talk with my husband. I hate my husband. Robert asks me how I ever happened to marry his father. He always recognized that I was superior to him."

Thus a son who is selected as his mother's confidant may become so closely attached to her that she turns to him for the companionship, affection, and advice for which she would normally go to her husband. The son accordingly takes over the "husband" role, while at the same time becoming so closely identified with his mother that he responds to his father with his mother's hostility and dislike.

Not only may attachments or antagonisms arise in the family between the parents and children but also between the children themselves. It is not uncommon for a brother and sister to become greatly attached to one another, or for two sisters to become closely identified. This is often met with in large immigrant families in which the mother's time is taken up in assisting

her husband in his business. In such situations the "mother" role is often taken over by the oldest girl in the family. As a consequence, this child plays an entirely different role than she would ordinarily, and the relations between all of the children tend to be revamped.

Where there is only one child in the family, there often develops an ambiguity of roles which in itself is a source of conflict. The child tends often to take responsibilities which enhance his position in the family and result in greater solicitude and attention. He accordingly develops considerable independence, particularly with reference to his communal contacts, and yet he is highly dependent emotionally, since his success in communal adjustments brings him greater solicitude and attention within the family circle. This ambiguity, therefore, furnishes the predominant note in his life pattern. While this fusion of roles is more characteristic of the only child, a child in a larger family may likewise take this role.

Many more illustrations might be given to show how the role of the child is determined in family interaction.¹ In fact, each of the types of disorganized personalities develops out of a peculiar set of family circumstances, as will be shown later. Communal contacts tend to be of secondary importance since the role in the family sets the pattern for communal relations. The individual seeks out those contacts in which he may continue to function as he did in the family unless for some reason or other that role was distasteful. Under these latter circumstances, however, the family role not infrequently becomes overshadowed by the communal, the person escaping, so to speak, the inferior position assigned him in the family.

When the individual's role in the family has been a satisfactory one, owing to his superior position, the achievement of this role in the community becomes his standard of adjustment. He tends to seek out those groups, therefore, in which he can become a leader and thus relate himself to the members much as he did to his brothers and sisters. Mechanisms developed in achieving the superior family role are utilized and depended

¹See Mowrer, Ernest R., *The Family*, pp. 123-41.

upon to achieve communal leadership. Avenues of endeavor are thereby marked out and the social world constructed in keeping with the patterns defined in the family. Failure to achieve this sort of communal adjustment gives rise to conflict and attitudes of frustration.

Success in reinstating the superior family role in the community may, however, be only temporary. Thus the pampered child may find individuals outside the family who are willing to relate themselves to him in much the same way as did his "doting" parents. However, this is ordinarily a precarious adjustment since adults demand some degree of reciprocity in their relations with each other.

The child whose position in the family has been inferior, on the other hand, tends to look to communal contacts as a realm for escape from the undesired role, unless his adjustments have taken the form of achievements in an imaginary world. In some instances, of course, this individual develops a fatalistic attitude which prevents and forestalls all attempts to escape from the inferior role. Achievement of a superior role in the community, however, is likely to be accidental and to develop out of special abilities not recognized within the family circle.

The child whose role in the family is "in-between," i.e., neither superior nor inferior, tends on the whole to adjust more uniformly to communal contacts. While he may, and often does, attempt to achieve a superior role in the community, failure to do so is accepted complacently so long as it does not mean the acceptance of an inferior position, just as he has accepted his "in-between" role in the family. Thus the "in-between" role, while differing greatly between individuals within the same family, tends to be characterized by less demand for social recognition and by greater emotional stability than is true in general of the other roles.

Successful reinstatement of the family role within the community does not, of course, insure success in marriage, since domestic discord frequently develops where there is no disorganization of personality. In fact, it is this absence of personal

disorganization that differentiates one group of cases from the other and leads to the analysis of domestic-discord patterns. Here the individual has been able in the past to cope with his problems but finds himself unable to adjust to his marriage partner.

When the disorganization of personality does not complicate the picture, the classification of domestic-discord patterns leads to generalized descriptions of conflict situations in which discord arises. Such conflict situations, however, are not peculiar to domestic discord but characterize all marriages. It is only when the conflict becomes so severe as to threaten the unity of marriage that any account is taken of it. But because of the absence of personality disorganization these cases are less complicated and more readily understood. They have, in fact, been frequently taken to include the whole of domestic discord. Since, however, such conflicts have their origin in experiences which follow those in which personality disorganization generally develops, the analysis of these situations may be appropriately deferred until the types of domestic discord developing out of personality disorganization have been analyzed.

Likewise, failure to reinstate the family role in the community does not lead inevitably to domestic discord, though such is the tendency. This is due to the fact that the individual tends to utilize the same mechanisms of adjustments outside marriage and particularly those developed in the early family group.

Marriage relations, accordingly, constitute simply another conflict situation in the life of the individual with which he is unable to cope. Classification of domestic-discord cases is, therefore, in terms of these trends in personality which give rise to conflict in marriage relations. Typical sets of conditions are again found, as is, true in those cases where personality disorganization is absent, but these aspects are overshadowed by persistent personality trends. In other words, the pattern of domestic discord is shaped by those elements which characterize the unadjusted life pattern of the individual.

The life pattern may be said to be *unadjusted* when the

individual's conception of himself and his role in society is of such a nature that it interferes with, rather than facilitates, his adaptation to social requirements. Here the individual's conception of his role is sufficiently contradictory to that of the community to tend toward the disorganization of personality. Thus the individual's conception of his role becomes so highly individualized that he finds it difficult either to accept the social definitions of that group in which he desires status or to find a group which will treat him more favorably for any length of time.

When the conflict between the individual and the group with reference to his role is complicated by the presence within the individual himself of two or more equally persistent roles, the pattern becomes more involved. This may be seen in the case of Mrs. D., who as the unconventional self wanted the security of an orthodox marriage and yet when conventionally married rebelled against the accompanying restraints. How this contradiction in roles leads to a progressive deterioration in the ability of the individual to adapt himself to the requirements of new situations may be seen in the following account:

"I was the serious type. My sisters were lively. I used to think more as a child. I was not a happy child; I was troubled. I was sensitive and proud. I had to go alone because I was not dressed well. I could not go with rich people, so I preferred not to go with anyone. I was ambitious; I wanted to get away. I helped in the house; I didn't mind it so much. I was romantic. My parents didn't care if I came to this country. My brother would look out for me.

"But I didn't know my brother very well. He was fifteen years older than I was. I worked and paid back every cent for bringing me here. He was a married man. He had a family in Europe. He brought me ahead of his family. He didn't understand me. I was sixteen when I came here. I was small. I did not menstruate until I was fifteen. I worked in a shop. I got ahold of a girl in America who was reading books. They were romantic books and books on sex; they exaggerated it. My brother didn't agree with my reading. I thought I knew more than he did. I pictured myself in a dream world. I feel lost entirely in my life. I feel I am doing a bum job when I should

be doing a partnership job. But I am known to have character, but I have no character to bring up my children.

"I have lived in a dream world, but I woke up to reality. I still dream. I was too much wrapped up; I didn't have many friends. I lived with strangers. I worked in a tailor shop in New York, breaking needles and hating it.

"I read about men in the books. I didn't trust any man. I didn't believe in marriage. I did not like work. I lived in New York fourteen years. I wanted to be a big actor. Then I met a man. He wanted to be a big actor, too, but he didn't have the talent. He was good looking; I was an attractive girl. I was ambitious at first, but it didn't last. I got so I liked men; I dreamed about them; I always dreamed about them. I loved two or three in my mind, but I longed for men. But I was not the marrying kind. I didn't crave a home. I didn't want marriage; it meant responsibility. I thought this man was wonderful. I had intercourse with him and I got pregnant. Then I dropped out of sight. I was ashamed and afraid people would find it out. Then I decided, 'Why should I get the blame and him free.' I decided he should marry me. I went to a home—a home for girls—but I couldn't stand it. It was not my type. My brother was out of town. He didn't know about the baby boy. At that time I lost track of my best friend. Then I went to work as a waitress in a hospital.

"After we were married we didn't live together for a year. Then it would be only for two or three weeks. At times I hated him. I had to go to court. I worked as hard as I could. I would move into a rooming house and take a room. I would be getting along fine; then my husband would get in touch with me. Then I would tell my landlady my husband is going to come in and live with me, and she would charge me a couple of dollars more. I always paid. He would stay awhile and then leave again. But I couldn't help staying with him. He went to the war. He was a carefree man. He would make money and spend it on women. I thought I would get revenge and make him pay.

"Then I went on after a few months leading my own life. I didn't advertise I had a child. I belonged to a dramatic club. Some people knew I was married; some thought I was single.

"I would hate my husband, and then when we were together I would forget. He ruined my life. He made me this way.

"I separated from my first husband (not legally) and came to Chicago. Then I met the man who became my second husband. My boy—at times I hate him—he looks like his father. Now and then I see the same traits in him and for the moment I think I do hate him.

"I met Mr. D. through my lady friend, who knew his father. My husband thinks I am thirty-five, but I am thirty-seven. I am five years older than he is. I told him just a little lie. My first husband was younger than I was, too. I liked Mr. D. I stayed here eight months and then went to New York. I had been married and yet I had not been married. I had hardly any responsibility with the first child. One week I would have a husband, the next week I wouldn't have. I led my own life and ran around.

"In New York I got a job doing hand sewing, earning \$35.00 a week. My lady friend took care of the boy. Then I came back to Chicago. I went to live with Mr. D. I did it because my girl friend said to me one day: 'Take your boy and get married. I can't keep him any longer.' I didn't have much feeling for him. I didn't know how I felt. I almost got cold feet, but I went to live with him. I didn't want to marry him. I didn't have any divorce anyway. I lived with him a year. It was the same as marriage; I lived under his name and everything. He didn't want people to know that we weren't married. Then I got pregnant. After he knew the child was coming, he insisted that we get married in the proper way. There was no forcing—he asked me. I used to laugh when he wanted to marry me.

"Before I married him I enjoyed relations with him. These occurred three or four times a week. He could be very affectionate. Since the child was born I can't stand him and I feel no satisfaction in the relationship. I have lived with him six years. He is a duty bound man. He has feeling toward me. We don't quarrel.

"He likes a nice home; he is more like a woman in that respect. To be a good housekeeper you have to put feeling in your home. You have to feel that this is your world. I could let my house go for a couple of days. He is just the opposite. He thinks I ought to love it. To me a home doesn't mean my life. He thinks like Americans. He is one hundred per cent American. Sometimes I think to myself I am not myself; I am another woman.

"His relatives—they mind their own business. They overdo it. They show no interest. They don't dislike me. They are working people;

they are not my world. Their view of life is different. I am not like the average person. The knowledge I have had and the life I have led is so different from the average person. I belong to the minority. I can't adjust to my home life. Most of the time I am miserable, but not all the time. Sometimes when I stay with him I feel natural. Sometimes I go out and shop and I feel that it is the natural thing. Other times the humdrum life drives me crazy. I begin to feel that I have no character. Whom do I make happy? Not my children. I can't correct them; I have no character. I am lost. I feel I have no spirit. I don't like my boy. He is getting more to understand it. My girl is spoiled. She thinks everything is coming to her. I treat her like a little baby. I have more likeness for her because she is small. I feel for the boy; he has had no luck. He has had only bad luck all through his life. Sometimes I think I will get used to things, but it is monotonous.

"To be good to my husband, to bring up my children nice—that is not my life. If I leave I will miss those things at times, but I will lead my own life and be more happy.

"Last year when I went to New York, I met a man in a rooming house. I had intercourse with him. He was much younger than I was. He was a student. At times he would not pay attention to me when I went to his room. I never knew a man like that. I couldn't get him out of my mind. I liked him. Then he went out of my life the same way he came into it. He decided that we must part. I thought I would go wild. Intimacy with him was not like with my husband. This world I live in now is not my world. I want to go away and lead my own life and get that spirit back in me. I am not a fit woman to care for my children. What good am I? I might as well go away and lead my own life. What kind of a complex have I got?

"I can't stand to have him touch me; it makes me sick. Since the first year I haven't enjoyed being with him. Men mean much to me. Sometimes I think I am not the type of woman to have just one man. When I was sixteen I longed for men.

"I feel lost entirely in my life. I see I can't do anything with my children. I can't discipline them. My little girl disciplines me. She knows everything that is going on. The other day, when my husband came out of the bedroom, my little girl said, 'Father, you have been with a lady.' I get so lost. I curse and swear at the children and I

know it isn't me. I am a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde; two different women. I want to go away and work out my own life. I will marry no man, but if I find one, I will live with him."

In the foregoing document there is portrayed what may be called the "unconventional life pattern." Mrs. D. early adopted radical ideas, lost interest in religion, and carried on promiscuous sexual relations. Her first marriage relationship was a disorganizing one, probably intensifying an earlier restlessness. This first marriage was characterized by an absence of economic security and by sexual promiscuity. The husband appeared occasionally in the role of a "lover" and the child was a liability "not to be advertised," for whom there was little maternal feeling. This marriage, however, was consistent with her life pattern.

Mrs. D.'s second marriage was characterized by conventionality. She possessed a conventional home and a conventional husband who supported her and protected her. In return he expected her to play the part of the conventional wife of the working-class group, that is, that of a homemaker with no interests outside the home. But an earlier free-lance life made Mrs. D. intolerant of conventionality. Marriage to her was not a conventional experience. When it was made such, it became unromantic and undesirable. As soon as sexual intercourse became a conventional experience, it was no longer something to be enjoyed. A husband who was not a "lover" was someone to avoid.

To say a life pattern is unadjusted, therefore, is not to put it into any absolute category. Adjustment is, after all, a very relative term. A life pattern which will be accepted by one group may not be acceptable to another. The problem of finding a group in which the individual can adjust to a sufficient degree that further conflict will not lead to greater strain upon the personality, or to the development of mechanisms which further handicap him, is one which the individual may not be able to solve. How he attempts to solve the problem of adjustment, however, determines the characteristic forms of unadjusted life patterns.

Various attempts have been made to classify types of unadjusted life patterns. The term itself, however, has not been used, preference having been shown for the more general term, personality disorganization. While a more complex classification of unadjusted life patterns will probably be worked out eventually, the following classification is a natural outgrowth of the case studies under consideration: (1) Conflicting Roles, (2) Dual Roles, and (3) the Escape-Response Pattern. The last type may be differentiated into three sub-types, depending upon the escape mechanism utilized: (a) Illness, (b) Drink, and (c) Phantasy.

These types, in turn, determine the pattern of domestic discord, since the individual attempts to adjust to the marriage situation in the same way he has attempted to adjust to situations outside and prior to marriage. His failure to adjust to the requirements of marriage, accordingly, is marked by those mechanisms which characterize his unadjusted life pattern. Thus there is a corresponding set or configuration of domestic discord for each type of unadjusted life pattern.

CHAPTER IV

CONFLICTING ROLES

Conflict between roles may be considered basic to the formation of all life patterns, since in every new situation conflicting attitudes tend to arise. The ways in which the individual solves these conflicts and the mechanisms he develops as aids in their solution, constitute the outstanding elements in his personality and provide the basis for the differentiation of life patterns.

There tends to be in every individual at least two sets of opposing forces. There is, first, that of his early milieu—those definitions given the child in the family group. An emotional setting is given these definitions by the family. They therefore tend to be less rational in outlook. Then there are those definitions given the individual later through his non-family contacts. These tend to be much more rational. Conflict, therefore, may be thought of as quite normal, and arising out of the contradictory definitions of the family group as over against the non-family group. A minimum of conflict is consistent with adjustment. Conflict becomes, thus, an inevitable situation and remains normal so long as it does not lead to disorganization of personality.

Cooley has said that every individual has as many selves as the number of groups to which he belongs. Since groups are usually in conflict, it is only natural to think of these various selves as in conflict. The normal outcome, then, is to work out some sort of solution between these selves. Solutions are always in terms of concrete situations. Some people get in the position of never arriving at any solution, either rational or non-rational. Conflict continues day after day. Solutions are sufficiently delayed so that other problems arise before older ones are solved,

and so the individual may seem to be under a perpetual emotional strain. This individual's personality is unintegrated, ambiguous, and undefined. One hears him spoken of impatiently as a person "who doesn't know himself what he wants."

Marriage initiates an additional series of situations in the individual's life calling for adjustment. Many individuals are better able to make this adjustment because they have already developed the habit of solving problems. In short, by the time they reach marriage, they have developed a life pattern which provides them with a workable technique of adjustment. But the individual whose pattern has been that of conflict is not accustomed to working out rational solutions to conflict situations. Problems arise in his work world and in his social world for which he can find no solution. Marriage relations also present an equally perplexing series of problems with which the individual is unable to cope. This inability in marriage relations to make an adjustment gives rise to what may be called domestic discord. Domestic discord, then, takes on the same patterning as that in other situations, and may be thought of as simply an additional situation in the larger conflict pattern.

In the lives of some individuals there is found a series of conflict situations extending over the whole range of experience. These conflict situations start with early childhood and continue consistently throughout various relationships. The form which the conflict takes in the marriage situation is no different from that in any other sphere of the individual's relationship. This may be seen, for example, in the case of Mr. E.

Mr. E., a salesman, age fifty, who has been married for twenty-one years, describes himself as "madly in love with another woman"—a Mrs. A., age thirty-six, an attractive blonde, the mother of four children. For several months Mr. E. and Mrs. A. lived together in an apartment hotel on the South Side. They have gone on occasional pleasure trips, including attendance at several trade conventions.

Recently Mr. E. returned to his wife and Mrs. A. to her husband. Various reasons have been given for this return. Mrs. A. has said at one time that it was for the sake of her chil-

dren, only to contradict it a little later by saying that she was pregnant, this latter explanation corresponding to Mr. E.'s.

Mr. E. and Mrs. A. continue to see each other and maintain that they are mutually infatuated. Mr. E. keeps a diary of his contacts with Mrs. A. and sees himself in the role of a "Great Lover." Mrs. A. also describes her contacts in romantic terms.

Mrs. E., forty-six, unattractive and matronly, is much in love with her husband in spite of her knowledge of his relations with Mrs. A. Although admitting that her husband has had previous affairs with women, Mrs. E. insists that it is all Mrs. A.'s fault and that were he to give up this woman, he would be a "wonderful husband." She refuses to consider a divorce.

Mr. A. until recently a friend of Mr. E., and apparently a man of lower social status, is willing to forget the whole affair so long as his wife has returned to him. At times he seems flattered that Mrs. A. has received attention from a man whom he considers socially his superior. It was upon his own suggestion, in fact, that Mr. E. first went out with Mrs. A., who seemed lonesome and neglected.

The children in both families are quite aware of the situation. Mr. E.'s six children, including two by a previous marriage, all condemn him and criticize their mother for her weakness in allowing their father to return. The A. children, too, are aware of the difficulty. During their mother's sojourn with Mr. E. they remained with their father.

The affair of Mr. E. and Mrs. A. is a casual topic of gossip in their group, but the attitude on the whole is one of tolerance. This group has been brought together by a common interest in a socialistic program. Its members are from the middle-class group—primarily physicians, dentists, lawyers, and business men. The contacts within the group are quite primary and there is a summer camp to which the wives and children go.

In this group, the behavior of Mr. E. and Mrs. A. is tolerated, i.e., it is neither openly approved nor censured. It furnishes an interesting topic of conversation, but aside from that the members are not fundamentally interested. Apparently neither Mr. E. nor Mrs. A. have felt any group pressure.

Mr. E. was born in Europe¹ and married his first wife at about the age of twenty. Soon afterwards they came to America, the wife dying four years later. There were two children by this marriage. A few months later Mr. E. married his present wife, whom he had known casually before his first wife's death.

Mrs. E. was born in Europe. She came to America at the age of twenty-one. None of the members of her immediate family ever came to the United States.

FAMILY ORGANIZATION

Mr. E. was next to the youngest of a family of seven children—three boys and four girls. Mr. E. says that the boys in the family all got the attention. His younger brother was the favorite. He says, "We were a good orthodox family."

Mr. E.'s mother's family were wealthy, while his father's family, although not wealthy, were educated and had high status in the community.

The mother and father got along fairly well together. The mother received an allowance from her family after her marriage and sometimes was irritated because her husband made so small an amount of money. The father died in Palestine, his wife refusing to go there.

Mr. E. speaks of himself as a "selfish child" because "I always had my own way." He was always restless.

Mr. E. has one sister in Chicago and one brother in Colorado. The remainder of his family is in Europe.

Mrs. E. was next to the youngest of a family of four children—two girls and two boys. The mother died when Mrs. E. was ten years

¹All identifying data, unless essential to the understanding of the case materials, have either been generalized or omitted. Thus street addresses have been eliminated if of no significance, or the geographical location expressed in such general terms as the east side, north side, etc. In the same way descriptive terms have been substituted for the names of the business places where the persons were employed, and cities, states, and countries have been merged with larger political divisions or briefly characterized. Fictitious names have been substituted for all first names. Also more general terms have been substituted, in some instances, for the more specific terms used by the patients; e.g., all apparatus for the prevention of conception have been called "contraceptive devices." In some instances this practice makes the phraseology seem awkward and indefinite where originally the expression was natural and specific, but it avoids the less desirable practice of substituting dashes for specific information.

old. Mrs. E. went to live with an aunt (mother's sister); a sister, aged sixteen, and a brother, aged thirteen, went to work; and the youngest child, aged four, remained with the father. A year later the father remarried.

Mrs. E.'s father conducted a small grocery store and the mother had always helped him. They got along fairly well together. There were two children by the father's second marriage. Mrs. E. strongly disliked her stepmother, as she felt the latter mistreated her brother. She was very fond of her aunt and uncle who always treated her "very good." In America, however, she thought of herself as an orphan.

Mrs. E.'s father is still living in Europe. She often hears from her younger brother, of whom she is very fond. She regrets that she has not been able to send him enough money to come to America.

CULTURAL PATTERNS

Mr. E. had a private tutor until he was fourteen or fifteen years of age. He studied religious philosophy and learned German and Russian. Mr. E. says that at the age of sixteen he joined a group of young radicals and later became involved in the Russian Revolution. The purpose of this group was "to organize the masses and teach them a philosophy and point of view." He says he was radical in his whole point of view of life, believing in "free love, denying religion, and advocating that one should live only by the sweat of his brow." However, Mr. E. says that as far as the latter slogan was concerned he regarded it as "some kind of a hobby" and that he could not bring himself to make any sacrifice for the idea.

Mr. E. says that his mother's family were very wealthy and gave her an allowance regularly throughout her married life. The father was "never a money-making man." "My mother's family kept him for his looks. He was a man of high standing in the community."

Mr. E. read works of Gorki, Tolstoy, Karl Marx, and Nietzsche. He read the Bible, giving it a more modern interpretation. More recently his reading has consisted mainly of newspapers.

Upon coming to America, Mr. E. became active in the Socialist party. He has always been interested in organizing groups.

Mrs. E. learned to read and write Russian. She never attended night school in America and never learned to write English. She was fond of the theater and of books. She had a large number of friends.

Mrs. E. belonged to the Socialist party before her marriage. She worked in the same tailor shop for three years.

SOCIAL INTERACTION

A. *Factors in Adjustment and Conflict between Family and Community*

1. *Economic.* At the age of eighteen, Mr. E. says he was a supervisor of highways in Europe. At the age of twenty, he married a "wealthy" girl.

While Mr. E. belonged to a group of young radicals which taught that it was "not right not to work and to live upon someone else," in practice he did not carry out his ideas. Upon coming to the United States, he worked as a presser, but "could not agree with the conditions," which, he says, were against his "rearing." Mr. E. could not "stand a foreman." With the help of his wife's relatives he went into the tailoring business, but failed.

For the past eighteen years Mr. E. has worked for insurance companies except for intermittent periods when he worked as a presser.

For four years (1916-1920), while in a midwestern town, he was district manager, but according to Mrs. E., lost his job when he embezzled the company's funds. Following this he left there, coming to Chicago where he worked for two or three months as a presser, earning \$100.00 a week. He then went to work for a life insurance company.

While working for another life insurance company he became involved in difficulty. He sold a \$500.00 policy to a Polish woman whose husband was on the point of committing suicide. The husband "went through with the suicide." The wife was about to collect the \$500.00, half of which was to be given to Mr. E., when she confessed to the priest, who advised her to tell the company. As a result Mr. E. was arrested and spent one night in jail. Through the efforts of his wife and his brother and "payment of a few hundred dollars," he was freed. He lost his position with the insurance company.

Mrs. E. speaks of her husband as a "born salesman." Fifteen years ago he received a diploma for his ability as an insurance salesman. At that time he earned \$55.00 a week. During the past year Mr. E. earned about \$5000.00.

2. *Health.* Neither Mr. nor Mrs. E. complains of any illness. They have had contacts with physicians in the past.
3. *Sex.* Mr. E. says that he had sexual relations with other women before marriage. He early believed in "free love" and never considered a "marriage ceremony necessary for sexual intercourse."

For the past five years Mr. E. has been intimate with a Mrs. A., who, he says, has a "much greater physical attraction for him than does his wife."

Mrs. A. has told Mr. E. that she is pregnant, but that she "is anxious to have a child by him." Mr. E. interprets this as meaning that "she is madly in love with me." He says, "I have cared for women—always."

4. *Cultural.* Mr. E. says he always had a large number of friends. "I can pick up friends on a desert; maybe it is my looks, I don't know."

While Mr. E. early asserted a disbelief in any form of religion, he later developed what he calls "a practical religion—a religious philosophy."

Mr. E. says that he always has been an "organizer." He organized a branch of a trade union. He also claims to have organized an immigrant protective league and a cemetery committee.

Mr. E. is a Zionist and a Socialist. Until five years ago he belonged to a prominent fraternal organization.

5. *Pattern of Life.* Mr. E. is emotional and acts impulsively. The romantic appeals to him. He is egotistical. He makes contacts easily and "front" means a great deal to him. He is frank and straightforward in an interview.

Mrs. E. has no "front." She feels inferior to her husband. She assumes a maternal attitude toward him and feels that "the other woman" has misled him. She is emotionally dependent upon him. She has little insight into her husband's behavior.

B. Factors in Adjustment and Conflict within Family Group

1. *Economic.* While Mr. E.'s earnings have always been large, according to Mrs. E., there were periods when his family did not benefit by them. In earlier years Mr. E. gambled and lost heavily. His standards of living have always been high. "He dressed like a sport, took trips, bought cars, attended cabarets, etc."

During the past five years, although his earnings have been large, Mr. E. has been hard pressed for money for his own household, the family having been evicted a number of times for failure to pay rent. Much of Mr. E.'s money is spent on Mrs. A. for clothes, presents, trips, etc. During the period he was out of the home, he gave Mrs. E. \$35.00 and \$45.00 a week. While at home he has paid the rent and "given his wife whatever she needed."

Mr. E. complains that his wife was never "economical." "If she had a dollar, she always spent it." He compares Mrs. E. to Mrs. A. whom he regards as "economical." "I wanted her to buy a nice coat and dress and she only paid \$22.50 for a coat and \$25.00 for a dress, and you should see how she looks."

2. *Health.* Neither Mr. nor Mrs. E. complain of any illness. Mrs. E. complains that her husband is "nervous and hot-tempered."

Mrs. E. claims that Anna has a congenital hip dislocation. Mrs. E. believes that her husband is responsible for the child's condition, he having contracted a venereal disease before her birth.

3. *Sex.* Early during their married life, couple had sexual relations every night; later three or four times a week. Mrs. E. says that her husband was "crazy about her."

Mrs. E. has had one abortion between the birth of the first and second child.

Couple have never used contraceptive methods. [Nine years ago Mr. E. practiced *coitus interruptus* for about one and one-half years.]

Mrs. E. says her husband contracted a venereal disease sixteen years ago and for three months they did not have marital relations.

Mr. E. says that Mrs. E. always gave him sexual satisfaction and never refused to have relations with him. However, compared to Mrs. A., he finds his wife sexually cold.

Mrs. E. experienced her menopause about four years ago.

4. *Cultural.* Mr. E. says that he is fond of opera, symphony concerts, and theaters—all of which his wife does not care about.

For the past five years Mrs. E. has attended insurance conventions with her husband which were held in various places, Hot Springs, Denver, French Lick, etc.

Mrs. E. considers her husband "superior," saying, "He is more educated than I am. He has a very good head; he came from a wonderful family."

Mr. E. feels ashamed of his wife when he introduces her to his friends. "I tried to interest her in books—she never cared." Mrs. E. is careless in appearance, rather unattractive, and appears several years older than her husband. Mr. E.'s friends say to him, "Is that woman your mother?"

RATIONALIZATIONS

Mr. E. tells the following :

"My father married a rich man's daughter. He was a bookkeeper for a firm. He liked to read, but he wasn't practical. My mother was fifteen years younger than my father. My father was quiet, but my mother was hot-tempered. They never got along very well. My mother felt hurt that she had to take an allowance from her parents. We always had all the physical comforts we needed.

"I lived in a small town, but it was a very intelligent town. I belonged to a group of young radicals. They believed in organizing

the masses. I got mixed up in the Russian Revolution. I left home when I was sixteen. My whole point of life was radical. I denied religion. The whole movement denied that anything existed above marriage. They thought that a marriage ceremony was not necessary for sexual intercourse; that it was just to please someone. I was inflamed with ideas, but it was some kind of a hobby. It did not mean much of a sacrifice.

"I was married in Europe. I married a wealthy girl. We came to America. It was the idea of the youth to come to America. My wife's relatives helped me. I was restless. I picked up the language in no time. I couldn't get used to American ideas. I believed that the salvation of the race was assimilation of the masses. Then I became more practical. I became a Nationalist.

"My first wife was crazy for me. My word was law to her. Then she died; I was all mixed up. I couldn't concentrate after that. My oldest sister was living in Chicago. She kept roomers. I lived with her. This girl [second wife] lived at my sister's. I saw that she was taking care of my child more than was my sister. I was twenty-five then. I thought to myself—my wife is gone—it is time for self-sacrifice. Self-sacrifice is not equal to me, but I am going to give the children a home. Then I said to this girl: 'Would you like to raise the two children? I will try to be a man to you.' I thought at the time that she was older. She worked in a tailor shop. She was an orphan girl. At that time I was making \$25.00 a week. Later I learned that she was not honest with me; that she had had dealings with a cousin. I knew her about three or four months. She liked me. We got married. I fixed up a flat. I found out that she was not a virgin. I believed in the equality of the sexes and I was broad-minded. I had had sex experience myself. Still I thought that she should have played fair with me. We had relations every night. She became pregnant immediately. We have had four children.

"I used to give her whatever she needed. She wouldn't go to the dentist unless I compelled her to get her teeth fixed. She was never economical. I like to travel. We never saved; a thousand dollars would go in a week.

"I was manager of an insurance office in a small city for four years. I had better standing there. I like that better. I organized an immigrant Protective League and a cemetery and a church. I had high standing. Since then I have lost my pep.

"I always liked to read. The Polish situation changed my ideas. The Polish Socialists took over the country and they made a distinction between the Poles and the Jews. That pushed me back in my own nationality. I always believed in one nation for everyone. I was always broad-minded. My wife never had much education. It always seemed that she didn't just belong. She wasn't broad-minded. She didn't develop. Philosophy always interested me.

"We never got along. A year after we were married I left for a day and came back. Two years later I left and stayed away two weeks. Ten or eleven years ago I left. Eight years ago I left for the fourth time.

"My wife has always been a good mother to me and a good wife, but she is lacking in companionship and equality. I introduce her to my friends and they say, 'Is that your mother?' Yet I would fight for her rights. I can't stand for anyone to talk against her. I admired women always.

"I met Mrs. A. in 1916. I knew her husband. He used to be a peddler. He peddled umbrellas. Through him I met his wife. I wrote him insurance. In 1920 I realized that I was interested in her. She was unhappy with her husband. He used to come to me and tell me what a wonderful wife he had. He thought I was a wonderful man; I was his God. He used to invite me to take his wife out and to become interested in her. He thought that my companionship would be good for her. In 1924 I started going out with her. I tried to interest her in books. She became interested. I became intimate with her. She was younger than my wife and I found her more attractive physically. She also had a pretty face. I am crazy about her. I loved my first wife, but not as much as this woman. It was not as pure a love as this one. I tell you I love her. Mrs. A., she used to pet me. I found shelter there. It is a fight between my duties and my heart desires. We have a right to each other. [Here Mr. E. wept.] When it comes to passion, I could never get tired of her. She pets me; she pays attention to me. She thinks I am wonderful. She is a doll. She keeps to herself. She reads. She takes English lessons because I told her to. She is about thirty-five years old. We thought that they [Mrs. E. and Mr. A.] would realize that things can't go on this way—that we can't go on with the old life. Then Mrs. A. said to me, 'Your wife will never divorce you.' We planned to leave Chicago. Then she went to see her children. They cried and she couldn't leave them. See these cuff buttons.

I weep; they are a memory to me. They represent life. Mrs. A. gave them to me. My wife cannot understand. She gets mad and yells at me when I mention the cuff buttons. She is so narrow-minded.

"When I don't see Mrs. A., I am restless and cry like a baby. I can't live without her. She says she is pregnant. She wanted to have a baby with me. She will leave her husband now. It has been just cat-and-mouse play. I went home because Mrs. A. decided to go back to her husband and children. It was a knock because she left me. I thought of committing suicide. Then I thought people commit suicide more for advantage.

"I can't analyze my wife—she is a mixture. She is very honest and good-natured. My wife wouldn't have acted like Mrs. A. She has a lot of good qualities.

"Financially I have done very well, but I have saved nothing.

"Mrs. A. and I planned to leave Chicago, then we couldn't. While I was working for a different company, I used a client's money. I was in jail for a day. But I wrote insurance for the detective. That was two or three years ago.

"I am romantic. She said she cares for me. If I can't satisfy her with my vitality, then I can satisfy her with something else. A man should be older than a woman.

"I don't love my wife. I can't just explain my feeling for her. I want myself to believe that she can attract me; that her body can attract me. That is the only thing left, but I know it can't. In the past it has. If I were a sculptor, I would mold an image of her body and keep it as a memory. That is the only thing that stands out of the past. I can't get along without her.

"The fundamental point of married life is love. Love comes from the heart. [Here Mr. E. quoted a definition of love from the Bible.] Sense has nothing to do with love. I know I am a criminal. After all, it is the heart's desire and I can't help it. Because of this, ten children are suffering—six of my children and four of hers. She is pregnant and I am going to take her to a doctor and put her under a doctor's care. She wanted it; she sacrificed for me and I am going to do the best for her. The child will have a name. If my wife won't take it and raise it, I will.

"I can't stand it. When I am petting my wife, I think of Mrs. A. I want to go to her. What kind of a woman is my wife? She sees that I can't sleep at night; I dream. I talk about Mrs. A. in my sleep, yet my wife wants me. The children are strange to me.

"I would like to go away from everything and concentrate my mind—maybe write a book or do things for society. I would write on the 'Unity of Matrimonial Life.' Wife and husband should understand each other. My wife is careless. A woman goes by barefooted—it has an effect. A little rouge and powder on a woman has an effect. My wife's carelessness has an effect.

"I saw Mrs. A. last night. I took her out in my car. She took off her galoshes. I kissed her all over; her lips, her eyes. I tell you I can't live without her. I went home and wrote up the experience. For years I have kept a diary. [Here Mr. E. read portions of what he had written on the previous night's experience.] The trend of it was as follows: 'I don't understand you, yet I love you. It is my wish that no one else shall touch me. I am sad because you are not clean; that you have been with another man [meaning her husband.]'

"I think I will always remain attractive to Mrs. A. My wife—she has been a good mother to me, but Mrs. A. is my life. I don't say that I would marry her. I don't believe in marriage, but we would go away together."

Mrs. E. tells the following:

"I hated my stepmother the way she treated my brother. My aunt took the place of my mother. None of my relatives came to America. I wanted to come because my girl friend came here. My father didn't want me to come. I came to America alone. I was twenty-one. In Europe I had a lot of relatives and friends.

"I came to New York. A girl friend who was married sent me a ticket. I paid her all back. She took me home, and I stayed with her. I lived in New York for four months. I went to work and made about \$2.00 a week. People didn't make much then. I had a second cousin in Chicago. He told me to come here. He died last year. He was fifty-four when he died. He had six children. I lived with them for a year and a half. I got a job here at \$7.00. I made friends. I went to the theater. I worked in one shop for three years.

"Three years later I met Mr. E. I went out with fellows. I came to America with two cousins—a boy and a girl the same age as me. All of us belonged to the Socialist Party. I was happy. My cousin—he was educated to be a bookkeeper, but he couldn't make anything here. I went to live with Mr. E.'s sister. My cousin lived there too. I saved \$150.00. I gave it to him. He went to peddle. I saw that he couldn't do it. He was sort of a schlemiel. He went to the country. While he was gone, Mr. E. started to talk to me. I was always looking for an education. I could read and write Russian. I wanted to marry someone better than my cousin. I liked Mr. E. I lived with his sister for two years. I knew his wife. He knew how to talk and sing. He belonged to the Socialist Party, too. I knew his first wife was crazy about him. I knew that his people were a very nice family and rich from the old country. He was a very handsome fellow. I thought he was more educated than I am. He had a very good head. He knew everything. I remember everything. His wife died. I felt so sorry for the children. I remembered myself how I felt when my mother died. His sister told him to pay her \$10.00 and she would keep the children. That's a lot of money for a man. I felt so sorry for him. He was making \$25.00 a week. The baby was crying for her mother. The child took a fancy to me. It has been twenty-one years, but I remember everything. There was no one to take care of the baby. The orphanage would not take the baby. He wouldn't give it to anyone to keep. Mary [the baby] was so pretty and she loved me. When I would come home from work, no one else could take care of her. She would watch for me and say, 'Rose [Mrs. E.] will come—Mary like candy.' I combed her hair. I remember what beautiful curls she had. I hated my own stepmother. I never thought I would want to be a stepmother. I hated the word. But I was twenty-five years old already. He told his sister that he would like to marry me. I thought to myself, he seems so wonderful—anybody can love a man like that. He sings and talks so nice and looks so nice. He was making \$25.00 a week. That was good money for that time. I thought, 'If he will marry me I will be the luckiest girl in the world.' He talked to me and said, 'You love Mary and she loves you.' Mary would sleep with no one else but me. He had a \$500.00 insurance policy from his first wife. He said he would fix up a nice home. I wondered what I should do. I had a nice hand; I held only the needle since I was ten years old. I hated the kitchen. Later I found out that he gave his brother-in-law \$25.00 to make the match. The Russian people know how to make love. He was that way. He told me he would make a wedding and he talked so lovely. I told

him I would talk to my cousin. [Not the cousin to whom she was engaged.] He told Mary, 'She is no more Rose, but she is going to be your mother.' The little girl was so happy. Then he told me that he did not want to go to a minister; that a ceremony was not necessary. But my father had written me, 'I know you belong to the Socialist Party and maybe you will go away with him. You must send me the agreement.' I told him I had to have a ceremony. I said, 'I want a white dress and a veil.' I wanted a wedding. We got married. He was the happiest man. My home was so nice. I was so lucky and I loved him.

"Then at the start there was no money. I started to live on the book. My floors were white like paper. My landlady taught me how to cook. But when I made coffee too hot he yelled, and when I made it too cold he yelled. Two weeks later I got pregnant. He was crazy about me. Every night we stayed together. When the baby was two or three months old, he didn't come home. I went to the shop. I saw him singing and laughing with girls. He forgot all about his wife. From that time on there was trouble.

"The first baby was a boy. He weighed thirteen pounds. You have never seen such a beautiful baby. The nurses talked about him—he had such nice skin. My husband was so happy. He would say to me, 'Rose, you are like a woman from Heaven that you gave me such a fine boy—a wonder child.' I loved the baby, but Mary was still my life. I stayed with the children. He was going to operas and I didn't know what an opera was. I had children one after another. After the children grew up, we went out together. He took me to conventions.

"He was always good to me. When I had a child, he was always by my bed. He was always strong sexed, but I was sometimes worse than he was.

"For five years he has been going with Mrs. A. In his sleep he used to say, 'My dear Irene.' That is how I found out about her. I love him so much—I was raised without love. He gave me so much love. Even when he beats me up, in two hours he falls on his feet and says to me, 'You are so good to me, you are wonderful.'

"Until he met Mrs. A., he always fought, but he liked the children. Now he doesn't care for his wife. He was always hot-tempered. Mary didn't talk to him for two years. Every word he says I know

isn't true. Then he tries to be nice to me. I would be happy if I didn't love him. Anna likes her father. The children like him. I can't stand it. I would like to kill this woman—then we would be happy. I know he loves me too. He can't live without a home and a wife. I love him like I love my children. He kisses me and holds me on his lap. I know he needs me. He can't get along without me. I would be happy if I didn't love him.

He knows how to make money—he is a smart man. Before coming to Chicago he was a manager. He had a private office with his name on the door and his own stenographer. One day I went to his office and the girl did not want to let me in. She could not believe I was his wife—I was dressed like a slob, and he looked like a prince."

Contradictory attitudes and beliefs were produced early in Mr. E. The conventional behavior and attitudes of his family were in direct contradiction with the radical beliefs of his non-family or school group. The radical group advocated free love, hard work, and denied the existence of a religion, while his family upheld conventional marriage and an orthodox religion. The idea that "one can only eat by the sweat of his brow" was contradictory to Mr. E.'s rearing in a home where the father did not work, but depended upon the allowance received from his wife's parents. Mr. E. evidently felt some loyalty for each group. He designates his radical beliefs as only a hobby, and makes a conventional marriage with a girl whose parents are wealthy. Since he considers a marriage ceremony neither necessary nor inimical for sexual intercourse, he continues with promiscuous sexual relations. Rebounding from a denial of the existence of religion, he developed what he termed a "religious philosophy," which was simply a phrase with no religious content. Thus he continues two roles—the conventional as over against the non-conventional—each in contradiction and in conflict with the other.

In Europe Mr. E. learned to be a presser since, according to the revolutionary code, one must learn a trade. An advantageous marriage helped him to escape from this type of work; but as an immigrant in America, he knew no other trade and was forced to go to work. He complains that he cannot endure

this labor as it is against his "rearing." Later he secures a position as an insurance agent and lives by his wits. When he loses his position, he reverts back to the pressing job. Later in his shifting from one insurance company to another, he works from time to time as a presser. His status is not clearly defined. The contradiction and conflict continue between his rearing, symbolized by the position as insurance agent, and those early revolutionary ideas, symbolized by the job as presser.

As time goes on, Mr. E. becomes an organizer. He thinks of himself as a friend of the people. He organizes a union; at another time, an immigrant protective league and a small church. He joins a lodge. He sees himself in the role of a benefactor. He is working for the people's interest. At the same time one sees Mr. E. as quite a different Self—rebellious, disorganized, embezzling funds, and cheating those with whom he comes in contact. Then for a time he is unable to play either role with any amount of consistency. His embezzlements are made public and he is arrested. The well-organized conventional Self feels a loss of status. He retires from his lodge, and a general decline in morale results.

About this time Mr. E. moved from a city of 75,000 to one of three million population. Here he made acquaintances of a somewhat different social world. From a Nationalist he became an ardent Zionist, advocating the establishment of a Socialist regime in Palestine. The group is large, yet many of the contacts are rather primary. The members are united in a common bond of interest in which Mr. E. participates. Through this participation he secures status.

In marriage Mr. E. has played two roles—that of a conventional husband and that of the non-conventional. His conventional Self is satisfied with the woman who is his wife. He is emotionally dependent upon her. Her maternal attitudes please and satisfy him. On these occasions he supports her even more than adequately. He has her accompany him to conventions and to an occasional party. His unconventional Self, however, is rebellious toward this woman to whom he is married, and who mothers him. This Self desires a woman who can be looked

upon as an equal and as a companion, not a woman to whom the social group refers as his "mother."

Mrs. A. stands out only as the type of woman who can attract him—the symbolization of all his radical ideas of the past. Thus the conflict and contradiction between his early revolutionary ideas and those of his early rearing continue. Mrs. A. symbolizes his early radical ideas; his wife those of his early family group. Just as he has never been able to accept and follow one clear-cut line of conduct as over against another, one finds him in marriage dependent upon two women, unable to give up either. Thus we may say that conflict in the marriage relationship (i.e., domestic discord) becomes a part of the general conflict pattern. That is to say, the individual's behavior in the family situation is consistent with his general pattern of response.

In addition to the personal disorganization of the husband in the foregoing document, one's attention may be called to the sex conflict appearing late in the marriage relationship. The couple had been sexually adjusted until shortly before the open break, which occurred at about the time Mrs. E. reached the menopause. Mr. E. complained of a weakened sex impulse on the part of his wife and compared her with Mrs. A., a younger woman.

One observes also a cultural differentiation. The husband has "developed" and made friends of a different social world than has his wife. She has never been acceptable to the members of his group.

Thus the individual in situations of the type represented in the E. case feels himself torn between two lines of conduct, neither of which is possible because of contradictory attitudes and tendencies to act. Conflict, however, tends not to continue indefinitely. Some solution usually is found. Such solutions may be either rational or non-rational.

Two forms of rational solution are possible. The individual may modify both elements in the conflict so that they become harmonious or in tune; or if a compromise is not possible, the individual may select one element as over against another, thus

accepting the one and abandoning the other. This conscious and deliberate selection of one set of standards or line of conduct, as over against another, however, may not always be possible. The abandoned element, for example, may not disappear, but on the contrary it may appear later in a different form. This, however, is what happens when there is repression, which is one of the methods of non-rational solution. Solutions are rational, therefore, only to the extent to which there is no repression.

Avoidance of the conflict through the mechanism of repression, however, is but one of the non-rational solutions. Another common method is dissociation, in which conflict is avoided by compartmentalizing the mind in such a way as to allow each conflicting trend in the personality to run its course without interference from the other. This, in turn, represents another type of unadjusted life pattern and another type of domestic discord.

CHAPTER V

DUAL ROLES AND DOMESTIC DISCORD

While many individuals have life patterns which hinder their adjustment, not all individuals are under an emotional tension due to perpetual mental conflict. Such a situation is avoided by never allowing the conflicting elements or the two antagonists to meet. Through this mechanism the scientist who is quite agnostic in the field of science can be orthodox in the field of religion. The business man who practices the utmost scrupulousness in his family life is able to follow a more flexible ethical code so far as his business transactions are concerned because the two spheres are kept rigidly apart in his own mind.

While this process of dissociation may in some instances become complete, it is, for the most part, a relative matter. Often opposing systems come into conflict at some points. This conflict, however, is not allowed to continue. Whatever tendency there is for conflicting elements to clash is taken care of through rationalizing. Rationalization may be thought of, therefore, as the mechanism through which the real significance of the incompatible forces is concealed. In other words, it brings consistency into the conflict situation by concealing the discordant elements from view. Thus the man who embezzles funds or who resorts to unethical business practices may rationalize, and in so doing justify his behavior, by saying that his children needed bread. The professional gambler who leads quite a conventional domestic life may rationalize his profession by saying that, after all, his gambling code is only that of the highly respected business man. His wife and children, therefore, are entitled to the same luxuries and social position in the community as the family of the financier.

The individual who experiences little conflict therefore, through keeping the elements dissociated, is more two individuals than one. That is, his personality is made up of dual roles. He is in other words two persons, each adjusting to a different set of social conditions but with one tending in no way to interfere with the other.

This dual role, of course, tends to complicate marriage relations, since the possibilities of restricting family contacts to one phase of the personality are limited. In so far as the wife becomes cognizant of the two personalities of her husband, she is not as likely to find herself as well-adjusted to the one as to the other. The domestic discord, therefore, tends to take the form of identifying any dissatisfaction which the wife has in marriage relations with that personality of her husband which she finds less harmonious with her own.

This type of domestic discord, while it has many elements of disorganization, may have many accord factors. In such instances one part of the personality is as stable as another. As one wife puts it in referring to her husband, "He is such a good husband when he is a good husband and such a father to his children." His being a good husband is constantly recurrent and, therefore, makes for a considerable amount of permanence in the marriage relationship. While the wife may, when in a state of emotional stress, criticize her husband and think of him only in terms of what seems to her to be his undesirable personality, this conflict becomes minimized in the presence of the ever-recurrent desirable personality. This pattern differs from that in which there are conflicting roles in that it lacks the constant irritation growing out of the reflected mental conflict of the husband.

In the following document Mr. K. is portrayed as an individual who throughout his life has adjusted to two different worlds, so to speak. After marriage his dual role is carried into his own home with almost perfect consistency. This consistency is achieved through the mechanization of rationalization, a process by which conflict is completely avoided on the part of Mr. K.:

Mrs. K. was born in Russia (1893), coming to the United States with her brother at the age of seventeen. She came directly to Chicago.

Mr. K. was born in Poland (1878), where he lived until he was twelve years old, then going to Germany, where he spent three years. He returned to Poland and later served in the Russian Army for four years. After his escape from the Army, he went to Germany, where he lived for four years, then coming to the United States. After spending five years in New York, he came to Chicago.

FAMILY ORGANIZATION

Mrs. K. was next to the youngest of six children—three girls and three boys. A younger brother of whom she was very fond, died about seven years ago. The father and mother are living in Chicago.

Mrs. K.'s mother and father always got along well together. The father owned a large mill, which he tended while his wife sold grain. The mother was a very good business woman.

Mrs. K. says she was fond of both her mother and father and that she was the pet of the household. She was a delicate child and was not allowed to do any housework. Two servants were kept.

Mrs. K. was particularly fond of her younger brother. They always played together as children and read together when they grew older. She talked over everything with him because she felt that he was the only one who understood her.

All the children of the family were given an education. One brother studied dentistry; another pharmacy.

Mrs. K. says that all the members of her family got along well except herself. She is the "only one who has lost her life."

Mr. K. was the oldest of a family of four children—two boys and two girls. The father died when Mr. K. was nine years old; the mother died thirty years later. A year after the father's death, the mother remarried. The stepfather was a wealthy wholesale dealer in iron.

Mr. K. says that his mother and father got along well together. The mother was a "stylish, up-to-date woman." The father, in ad-

dition to being a rabbi, held a Government position as registrar of births and deaths. He was well-to-do financially.

Mr. K. was fond of his stepfather, who treated him like "his own son." At the age of twelve, Mr. K. went to Karlsbad, Germany, with his stepfather, who was in poor health. After a few months the stepfather returned to Poland, Mr. K. remaining in Germany for three years. He was apprenticed in a shop where he learned the "flash-light" business.

At the age of twenty-one, Mr. K. entered the Russian Army, where he served for four years, then escaping to Germany, where he remained for four years. Before Mr. K. left for the United States, his mother came to Germany to see him. At that time she gave him sixteen thousand rubles.

Mr. K. speaks of himself as his mother's favorite because "I was the oldest of the family and I looked like my mother." He says that when he was at home he was attached to his brothers and sisters, but that when he came to America, they considered him as "dead." He has heard that his brother is a Reformed rabbi in Germany; that one sister is a doctor in Poland and has never married. The other sister is married and is living in New York. Mr. K. does not hear from her. He says, "In New York she did not want to know me. If I wrote the story of my life as far as my family are concerned, it would be the story of the 'blacksheep.' "

CULTURAL PATTERNS

Mrs. K. attended school in Russia and also had a private teacher. She learned French, German, and Hebrew. She attended four classes of gymnasium. After coming to the United States, she went to night school for six months.

Mrs. K. says that her father came from a family who liked to read. She herself was "always sitting in the library." She "read works of Tolstoy, Ibsen, Nietzsche," etc. She learned nothing of housework.

During the revolution of 1907, Mrs. K.'s father's property was confiscated. He decided to come to America because he wanted "to be free, and because he didn't want his son to learn a trade." Mrs. K. says, "In our family it was beneath us to learn a trade." In America Mrs. K.'s father became a Hebrew teacher.

Mrs. K. was fond of movies and the theater. She belonged to a Zionist group in Chicago, where she met "nice, educated people." Mrs. K. had girl friends, but most of the men she met were "too vulgar." She always liked people, never wanting to be alone. She says she had a "joking, carefree nature, but liked serious, educated people."

Before her marriage Mrs. K. worked as a finisher of men's clothes, earning \$12.00 and \$14.00 a week. She says that she was able to save \$500.00.

Mr. K. was the son of an Orthodox rabbi. He says, "There were generations of rabbis on both my mother's side and my father's side." For twelve years Mr. K. prepared to be a rabbi. He passed the sixth class in gymnasium.

Mr. K. learned to speak Russian, Polish, and Hebrew as well as English. Although brought up in an Orthodox Jewish home, he became a Reformed Jew while in Germany.

Mr. K. says: "I came from a famous family. I am somebody. But I have been a victim of circumstances. People have always liked me because I was so educated."

Mr. K. is fond of attending lectures. He has always been interested in writing and says, "If I had plenty of money, I would spend all my time writing."

SOCIAL INTERACTION

A. Factors in Adjustment and Conflict between Family and Community

1. *Economic.* Mr. K. has been in the furniture business on several occasions, each time going into bankruptcy.

According to Mrs. K., her husband has served a ninety-day sentence in jail for forgery. She claims that her husband had taken advantage of women customers and acquaintances by appealing to their sympathy and promising to marry them in order to get money from them. The last episode Mrs. K. can recall was with a woman "who gave him money and bought him an overcoat." For several months he kept his clothes in her house. During that time Mrs. K. had sexual intercourse with him once in two weeks. He explained the

situation to his wife saying, "She is a nice lady and it will only be for a few days."

Mr. K. says: "If a party came to me and told me there was a woman I could get interested in my business, or if I saw a woman and I could get money from her, I would do it. If she took a personal interest in me, I would allow that too. Why not? I would do that for the sake of my children. My wife would not object either. She never has. She knew all about my dealings with women. She was glad because she knew it meant money for the children. I have been told that I am a good salesman—a shrewd salesman. Yes, if it meant selling something, even though it wasn't straight, I would do it. I wouldn't worry about the person getting cheated. I probably would be unscrupulous and take advantage if I could."

Mr. K. is at present working as a furniture salesman on a commission basis. He is sure he will make good because he knows "how to get around people."

2. *Health.* Mrs. K. has had four abortions.
3. *Sex.* Mrs. K. accuses her husband of having relations with other women. Mr. K. says, "I can't remember; maybe I have. It is probably true; we forget the things we want to forget. Yes, I have had."
4. *Cultural.* Mr. K. before his marriage was interested in attending lectures. In New York he heard and was an admirer of Stephen Wise. Since his marriage he has not gone with his wife to a lecture or to a show. He is opposed to Orthodox Jews "who only wear a mask." He is bitterly opposed to the Jewish religion, but follows some customs such as "saying Kaddish for his father," etc.

Mr. K. is fond of shows, particularly of the type of *Abie's Irish Rose*.

The couple do not go out together, nor do they ever have friends come to the home.

5. *Pattern of Life.* Mrs. K. seems more motivated by security than by any other wish. When conflict has arisen in adult

life, Mrs. K. has attempted to take the course which entailed the least responsibility and constructive activity on her part. She, like her husband, has some sense of the dramatic, but this is held in check by a keen sense of humor.

Mr. K. sees himself as an actor on a stage. The romantic appeals to him. Every sentence is accompanied by gestures and "grandstand appeals." He is what in common sense is called "temperamental." He is a clever opportunist and yet feels that he has never had a chance. He shows a rather high degree of adaptability, which is augmented by his facile verbalization, yet inconsistency is the essential feature of his activity.

B. *Factors in Adjustment and Conflict within Family Group*

1. *Economic.* Mr. K. claims that his business enterprises have always failed because of his "unhappy married life," while Mrs. K. believes that they were due to his "affairs with women" and his unscrupulous conduct (forgery, obtaining money under false pretenses, etc.).

Mrs. K. says that her husband has always given her money by the day—\$2.00 and \$3.00 a day, saying, "This is not my money I'm giving you." He has objected to her buying articles for the home; i.e., when she bought towels, he would give her no money, saying, "Chew up the towels. You don't need money." He often buys candy and pastry for the children, which makes them very fond of him.

2. *Health.* Mr. K. complains that his wife is "nervous, i.e., she laughs, cries, and whistles all in the same moment."

Mrs. K. complains of "womb trouble," saying, "Some people would be dead having so many children.¹ I am a European, that is the reason I am living."

3. *Sex.* Mrs. K. says that she has not had any pleasure from intercourse with her husband. The marriage relationship was a shock to her, and when she refused to have relations with him on the first night of their marriage he threatened to divorce her. Recurrent refusals upon her part have been followed by similar threats.

¹Mrs. K. has five living children. She has had four abortions and at the time of the interview she was again pregnant.

Mr. K. says that his wife told him a few days after they were married that she found him sexually compatible.

Mrs. K. accuses her husband of producing her four abortions. She claims that he has tried to practice *coitus per anum* with her. When she refuses intercourse with him, he accuses her of having other men.

Both Mr. and Mrs. K. say that relations have occurred on the average of three times a week when they were friendly. There have been periods of two months when they did not live together.

Mr. K. says that his wife does not satisfy him because she completes the cycle well in advance of him. Each accuses the other of not wanting to use contraceptive measures.

4. *Cultural.* Mrs. K. accuses her husband of being a converted Jew. He tells her, "Sunday is my holiday; Saturday is your holiday." When Mrs. K. lights candles in the house, he blows them out. He has refused to allow her to buy "Pesach dishes." He tells the children there is no God, while Mrs. K. tells them to believe in God because, "It gives them faith that things will come out good." She says, "He calls us all 'sheenies' each day of the week." Mr. K. tells his wife that he came from a superior family, saying, "You can't compare my descent with yours. Yours is a low-class Jew."

RATIONALIZATIONS

Mrs. K. tells the following:

"I was a delicate child, not so strong. I liked nice clothes. I was close to my brother. He understood me. The Russian peasants took away my father's mill. I can remember the Revolution—all the parades. People wanted to be free, but my father didn't want to be a Revolutionist. He decided to come to America. Four of the children were already in America. My brother and sister were here, working on furs. My oldest brother, the dentist, was here. I came to America with my younger brother two months before my father and mother came. My father was held up on account of his eyes.

"We didn't have any trouble getting along here. We liked America. I got a job working on men's clothes. Jacob didn't do so well. He

had studied pharmacy in Europe, but had to pass an examination here.

"At first I liked the work in the factory. We all liked it here because we were free. My father used to say, 'This will be our country forever.' Then I got tired of working in a shop. I was working just like a machine, always having to punch the clock. I was tired of everything.

"Then an old man from the synagogue brought over Mr. K. He knew how to talk to a girl. He was a smart man. The men I had known had been too vulgar. He was a nice-looking man. He said he had an aunt here. I knew him eight weeks and married him. My parents wanted me to wait longer. He was a salesman of furniture. I wanted to get married because I wanted to have a home. I was so tired of working in a shop. I was twenty-four when I got married. I thought that I would have a happy home. I hoped to marry a man like my brother Jacob. He didn't like Mr. K. I had \$500.00 saved. Mr. K. took the money and bought a furniture store.

"We always had trouble about living together. We had trouble the first night. When I refused him he told me the next morning that he didn't have a wife, and he would divorce me. He has been telling me that ever since. Three times a night was not too often for him. I was a delicate girl and when he went to jail I felt my life was saved. He had been that way with other women. Rose, when she was here, told me some of the things he did to women. He called me names and told me I had other men. At first I was a girl and didn't understand what it meant. I thought I would marry a man who would treat me nice, take me out, buy me nice clothes, and not call me names. I thought he would be a pal.

"I don't believe he is a Jew. He is converted. He doesn't believe in God. He calls me 'sheeny' and the children that, too. He says that Sunday is his day. He doesn't want me to tell the children that there is a God. I believe there is a God because it gives a person hope. It gives you strength to get through your troubles.

"An old woman came over once and told me that my husband had deceived her. He promised to marry her. When we had the store, one of the children got sick. We had to have a nurse. The nurse told me that my husband didn't let her sleep by night. He wanted her.

"After he was in jail, he wore dark glasses so that he could not be recognized. I was pregnant then. He used to make crosses and have doings with Christian people. Maybe he was converted in the jail.

"We are two different people. We never went to shows together, never had any friends. He never brought anyone to the house.

"He used to call me crazy. He didn't like my parents. He used to make scandals. He would open the door and call the police.

"He has had doings with women. He wanted their money for business, but he didn't like them. My brother Jacob didn't like him. Jacob—I will never get over him! My baby is named after him.

"My husband has always been a crook. John was in partnership with him and Jacob was in partnership. That was about eleven years ago. They were together about two months. He can only be a partner with a dishonest man.

"He is slick and he knows he is. Last winter, when he was in the store, an old lady came in for a quilt. She said she wanted an old-rose one. He began crying and said, 'That is the color my wife liked. She has been dead for seven years.' She felt sorry for him and he got her money away from her. Somehow I don't know how it was, but he went to a lawyer and got some papers [power of attorney] which gave him the right to sign her checks so that it would not be forgery.

"Last winter he had a store. The store got broke. I think it was in February. The business went broke after Easter. I wanted him to make a new life. I begged him for Pesach dishes. My mother bought them for me and paid \$3.00. She sent me matzoths. My husband told me to starve with my sheeny children. Then my people gave me \$100.00 for him to be a peddler, but not a crook. I gave him \$10.00 for a forged check, and \$1.00 spending money. Every week he spent \$20.00 for food; \$7.00 he spent for shoes. I gave him \$20.00 and he left for Cleveland. He said he was going to look for work. That night I refused to have relations with him. He was going to leave at three o'clock in the morning. On July 15th he came home to see us. While he was gone, I was compelled to ask for aid. He sent two checks, but I didn't receive them. Then

I wrote him a letter. 'For thirteen years I am suffering. You always poisoned my life. I want support and a divorce.' He said he got sick from the letter, then he came back.

"I want a divorce. For him it will be better. If he won't support me, I'll give the children to a home.

"Whenever he helped me clean the house, he opened the windows and hollered so, I better clean it myself. He is a fine man. He says, 'You are dirty and I am clean.' Of course, he is clean; he changes his name so often.

"Sunday he was in the house. He wanted me to give him a cup of tea. Tea I should give him and have him say I poisoned him! The children like him. It is natural for them to like a father. He gives them ice cream. I tell you the truth; I don't want him."

Mr. K. tells the following:

"My father was an Orthodox rabbi. My grandfather was a rabbi. They were all rabbis. I prepared to be a rabbi for twelve years. When I was four years old, I was through with Jewish prayers. When I was six, I was through with the Talmud. My father was a smart man. My mother was a stylish and up-to-date woman, who used to go to Paris for style. My father had an inheritance. He died when I was nine years old. He was a high official among Jew and Gentile—an educated man. He died on a Thursday night at twelve o'clock. When I was home, I always mentioned this to my wife. Each week I thought of it. When my father died, I was nine years old. A year later my mother remarried. My stepfather treated me good—even better than my own father because my father had to give away his time to the city. He was registrar of births and deaths besides being an Orthodox rabbi. This man was in the wholesale iron business. He bought a title to marry my mother.

"When I was sixteen, my stepfather took me to Germany for a trip. He went to a health resort. He let me stay for three years. I learned to be a business man in Germany—the flash-light business—a new business. Then I went back to Poland. I was four years in the Russian Army. I was wounded in the Russian-Japanese War. I was a good shooter and a good horse rider. I had passed sixth class in gymnasium. If there had not been a war, I wouldn't have had a chance. I had a bullet in my neck. I escaped from the Russian Army and went back to Germany. I tried to learn the business.

I was four years selling furniture. Then my stepfather died. My sister was in New York. I decided to come to the United States. My mother came to Germany to see me and gave me my inheritance. I was my mother's pet. I looked like my mother. My Dora looks like my mother. I came to New York and started in the furniture business.

"I was a quiet person. I believe in the Ten Commandments. I have no use for the Orthodox Jews. You can't make them out. I changed in Germany. My wife tries to tell the children that things should be kosher. She says, 'Don't cut bread with that knife. Let it stick in the ground first.' I call it nonsense and my wife calls me a goy.

"I was in New York five years. New York is all right, but if they see a fellow like me, they want to get next to him. I was sick in New York, and an old maid took care of me. When I got well I asked to pay for her services. She told me, 'Nothing else but you can pay for the services.' Then I had a bigamy charge on my hands. She couldn't prove that I took out a license. It was a frame-up. I left New York to get away from her. Then she framed me on a bigamy charge. In New York I went to meetings; I heard speakers; I saw shows. I made from \$50.00 to \$100.00 a week. I made big money when others made \$6.00 a week. I was the first Yiddish auctioneer in New York. My sister was already there, but she denied me.

"I was in Chicago a couple of months when I met my wife. I stopped in a synagogue to say Kaddish for my father. When they heard me saying Kaddish, everyone fell in love with me from the rabbi to the janitor. Then an old man said to me, 'Would you like to talk to some educated people? Would you like to go to their house?' Then my father-in-law fell in love with me. My wife fell in love with me. My brother-in-law fell in love with me. I spoke Russian, Polish, and Hebrew. Why shouldn't they fall in love with a type of man like that? This was my second frame-up. I found my wife sitting in the parlor with a French book in her lap. I wanted to meet a prominent party. I thought she was one. She kept a Russian dictionary in the house. I knew her three weeks. The old man told me if I wanted to marry her, I could do it right away. If not, I couldn't have her at all. He wouldn't give me time to think it over. He told me, 'We will provide a home for you. We will see that you are taken care of.' In order to sell their mer-

chandise, they didn't care. They knew that she was a nervous girl. She didn't have a pretty face, but I liked her form. She was a nice thing. She was delicate. She didn't like me at first, but after a week or so, she said that I was the right man for her, because I was strong. I believe I satisfied her. She would stay with me a while and then she would refuse. She can cry, laugh, and whistle all in the same moment. She doesn't satisfy me now. She has no use for me.

"Have I gone to other women? That is the difference between humans and animals—will power. A man must use will power. [Here Mr. K. gave a long and detailed talk on will power and the origin of the human species.] I don't know whether I have been to another woman. Maybe I have and have forgotten. Yes, it is true people sometimes forget what they want to forget. Human beings are like that. Yes, I have been.

"Her folks thought I was a money maker. Ten years I lived in their shanty and they paid for it that way. They found out that I am more highly educated than they.

"My business failed because of my family difficulty. I used to prepare the breakfast. She can't get up early. She ruined my business. I had to do the shopping and wash diapers and see that the children went to school.

"I never got along with her parents. I told them, 'You know who I am. You can't compare my descent with your descent.' Her father is very orthodox. They are a low-class family. They took away my life.

"She never cleans things. We never sit together at the table. There are no peaceful days. I took it for my children's sake. The house was always dirty. Yet she told me that I didn't clean it right, and that I didn't clean the pots right. I cleaned the house and I neglected my business.

"In my heart there is goodness and justice for my children. I am a victim in this world. Marriage to me should be different. Unhappiness in marriage is disagreeing; happiness is the agreeing. If you like a person, all their mistakes must smooth out.

"It is true that I like to manage things. I like comical things. I like plays where people fight and come together again. I have read

everything. I am writing a play. It is called *The Two Lords*. The two lords are McDonald and Levi. McDonald and Levi quarrel and then come together again. I have written a prologue. If I could write a story of my life, it would be the story of the black sheep or the victim.

"I go to see the children. The trouble with my wife is she has no settled mind. She don't know what she wants. She has no use for a person one minute and likes them the next. She is always disagreeing. Her family have always disagreed. It is inherited. They put on a mask. You get confused. You don't know what they mean.

"I have never been happy in my life, only the first seven days after I was born. When I came to Chicago, I wanted to make a new start. I looked into such a shining life—a new life. Now I see only clouds. I am fighting into those clouds.

"I'm writing a love story, too. I like *Abie's Irish Rose*. I wish I could write stories like that. It does a lot of good. It cleans a new road. Tolstoy's writings were wonderful things. Writing prepares a future and prevents crime. I like to write.

"I don't know why my wife came and talked about me. It is because a child has to have a name. A complaint has to be a complaint. Tell me what to do and I will do it. I am willing to listen to good people.

"I like to write sketches. Sometimes I see myself as an actor on the stage.

"My mother-in-law has told my wife that I need a colored woman, that I am so strong. That is the idea my wife has. She is pregnant now. We had intercourse about twice or three times.

"I am living in a bath house now. I don't want to take a room because I don't want to be reminded of how other families live. My children, I love them all.

"I'm a salesman—a shrewd salesman, people tell me. Yes, if it meant selling something, even though it wasn't quite straight, I would do it. But a man does not sing praise of himself. I was robbed of \$42.00 in the bath house. I have moved from there.

"I have always suffered in this world. I have been a victim of circumstances. They took away my life. I will try the best for my children. I am willing to live with my wife if she will let me come home. I am a family man. There is good in me. I am somebody."

Mr. K.'s first role was defined for him by his early family contacts. His training to become a rabbi was in keeping with his traditional rabbinical background. As the oldest son in an orthodox Jewish family, he had no choice other than to take over the work of his father. How deeply he cared for his mother is not known. He speaks of being favored by her. However, later one finds him saying Kaddish¹ for his father with no mention of his mother; which would seem significant.

Until the time Mr. K. went to Germany his role was that of a respectable orthodox Jew. In Germany, however, another role was defined for him by his contacts with the non-family group. Here he makes non-Jewish contacts. He becomes more a man of the world than a follower of Judaism. He discards orthodoxy with the result that his family "denies" him. However, his mother does meet him in Germany and provides him with his inheritance, which he uses to come to America.

In this country Mr. K.'s early training is no remunerative asset to him. It does, however, furnish him a point of contact with certain people in the community, when he cares to make use of it. He is first an auctioneer and then a salesman. His greatest remuneration, however, even at that early date, probably came from his contacts with women. He marries his landlady probably for the purpose of securing what money she possessed, although he gives a rationalized account of marrying her in payment for the care she bestowed upon him during an illness. Then he leaves the city to rid himself of her. At that time Mr. K. probably experienced some conflict, as the dual roles were much less clearly defined.

In a different city one sees Mr. K. reverting back to respect-

¹In Jewish ritual, the doxology recited in the synagogue at the close of prayers, and composed of praise and invocation of blessings. To show reverence for the dead, a male relative (usually a son or son-in-law) goes to the synagogue each year on the anniversary of the death of the parent to perform the ritual.

ability with a vengeance to make restitution for past sins. He again marries; this time a woman who is the very essence of the person his family would have wanted him to marry. The girl is from an orthodox religious family. Her father is a Hebrew teacher and she herself seems well educated. In addition she has saved \$500 which serves as a convenient substitute for the traditionally required dowry. It is a conventional and respectable union which might easily have taken place in his home in Warsaw with the sanction of his family group. It makes little difference that it is a bigamous marriage. This is taken care of by rationalizing that he was framed in the first marriage, anyway.

But the other personality soon comes to the fore. Mr. K. continues to be married but he sees a certain amount of inconsistency in his selves. At times he forgets he has a wife but when he comes home he remembers. Then he rationalizes that she is a wife only to one part of his personality. She is inferior and, therefore, cannot belong to his social world. He rationalizes further that his wife is a counterfeit. Therefore, he is justified in being a counterfeit—blaming her for what he knows himself to be. He cannot deny that Mrs. K. is his wife because he is married to her, so she is his wife only part of the time.

Soon one sees Mr. K. playing a dual role in regard to his business practices. He is a respectable man with a legitimate business; and he is at the same time an embezzler and trickster, using his business to defraud women customers.

He carries his dual role further into his home. The presence of children in his home adds to his respectability. He likes his family and yet he does not like them. He is Jewish, but he hates Jews. He says he is a Christian and makes crosses; yet he goes to the synagogue and says prayers for his deceased father. He calls his own children "sheenies," inferring that he, their father, is not Jewish. He tells them Saturday is their Sabbath and Sunday is his. Thus he is both a Jew and a "goy."¹ He swindles Jewish women; but he is not Jewish. Thus he can swindle them because he is justified in taking advantage of the out-group. He is single; and yet he is married. His Jewish personality is married;

¹A non-Jew.

his non-Jewish is single. All Jews are crooks, he says; but he is not a Jew. He is justified in taking advantage of people who are crooked.

Thus one sees Mr. K. over a period of years, playing the part of the unrespectable, unscrupulous, non-Jewish, single man as over against the respectable, Jewish, married man—but with one role interfering little, or not at all, with the other.

Mrs. K. realizes that her husband is different at different times. Her attitude toward him is, therefore, ambivalent; that is to say, at times she likes him and at times she dislikes him. Her disappointment in marriage, the irritation of too many children, and the presence of a certain amount of sex conflict, are all identified in her mind with her husband's non-Jewish personality.

This non-Jewish personality of Mr. K. is thus the basis of much of Mrs. K.'s feeling of dissatisfaction with marriage. Uncertain financial support due to business transactions contrary to the accepted code are related in Mrs. K.'s mind to her husband's non-Jewish personality. Conflicts with reference to cultural and religious differences, are identified not with the Jewish, but with the non-Jewish personality of Mr. K. Domestic discord, therefore, tends to take the form of identifying the whole of the non-Jewish personality with the conflict elements but with a feeling of accord so far as elements of the Jewish personality are brought to the fore.

Sex conflict, on the other hand, while not so directly related to the non-Jewish personality of Mr. K., grows out of the ambivalent situation. Sex contacts on the part of Mr. K. outside marriage lead to dissatisfaction with those within marriage and cause Mrs. K. to identify sex contact with what she considers to be her husband's undesirable personality.

Avoidance of conflict through dissociation as in the case of Mr. K. is not the only way out of the dilemma. Some persons because of early experiences the nature of which is not clear, are unable to resort to dissociation and so work out schemes of repressing one element, thus allowing a free field for the other.

Repression, however, does not eliminate the influence of

the repressed personality since it tends to find expression by taking on characteristics which bring it in harmony with certain aspects of the dominant role. Thus the discordant elements are allowed to escape the censoring influence of the socially sanctioned phases of the personality and to find outlets for satisfaction which otherwise would be closed.

CHAPTER VI

THE ESCAPE-RESPONSE PATTERN: ILLNESS

Some individuals, while their personalities may be said to be made up of dual roles, are unable to play both of these roles without the interference of each with the other. One way of avoiding this conflict is by abandoning the one role and leaving the other in possession of the field. In other words, the role which the individual would like to have in the foreground, but which is disapproved by society, or which he is unable to maintain, is repressed. Once repressed, however, it may gain expression indirectly and thus be brought into harmony with the individual's role as defined by society. Thus a man who is sexually unable to satisfy his wife endeavors to rid himself of his feelings of inferiority by banishing the thought from his mind. He develops a "sickness" which society defines as a sufficient cause for his ceasing to have sex relations with his wife, since the close contacts might expose her to his "disease." In reality, of course, the sickness is highly exaggerated and takes the form of complaints of pains, general weakness, dizziness, etc.

Repression of a painful element by the exaggerated development in consciousness of the opposite quality is another way of disguising the essential conflict between roles. This is seen in the case of a man who had been sexually promiscuous over a period of years. He became interested later in rescuing girls from brothel houses and was spoken of as the "benefactor of fallen girls."

Still another variation in this mechanism may be seen in the remorse of a man who, having remarried soon after the death of his first wife, developed an exaggerated fondness for his young daughter, with whom he slept, refusing all contact

with his second wife. He thus is able to remain faithful to his first wife blotting from his memory the unpleasant second marriage.

Since the individual is not always able to reinstate in the community the superior role he held in the family group, he experiences a deflation in his personality. If this individual were allowed to continue his earlier role, he would have higher social status than society now grants him. He, therefore, goes about to find a way of reinstating this earlier family role. That is to say, he tries to escape from the position defined for him by society, and to retain his earlier role as defined by his family group. One situation after another, accordingly, is met with an escape response, until he becomes habituated to this type of reaction and seeks in every conflict situation an escape from the elements which are most repugnant to him. He is able to do this by adopting certain escape mechanisms, the most common of which are attempts at suicide, sickness, "spells," phantasy, drink, and delinquency.

Rarely, however, does one find one mechanism used to the exclusion of the other. Sickness, "spells," and phantasy are usually combined, and it is not unusual to find drink along with complaints of sickness and attempts at suicide.

The selection of the particular escape mechanism varies from case to case but is usually one which is condoned by the culture of the group. One of the most common mechanisms used is that of illness. Illness meets with social approval. In our society, it calls for sympathy and understanding. An individual who is ill is excused from responsibility and he deserves special consideration.

Illness tends at first to take the form of complaints of back-ache, general weakness, headache, dizziness, shooting pains throughout the body, "spells," heart trouble, nervousness, etc. Contacts with physicians, however, tend through negative suggestion to lead to self-diagnosis and to further complications. Thus, an individual who complains of general nervousness, heart palpitation, dizziness, and general weakness goes to a physician for an examination. While these symptoms are sug-

gestive of a heart condition, the physician finds no conclusive evidence. He accordingly tells the patient that he does not believe he has a heart condition but that, of course, he cannot be positive upon first examination. This only convinces the patient that he has the disease in question since it provides for him the escape for which he is looking. Thereafter, even though it is quite definitely established that he does not have an organic heart disease he continues to search for a physician who will give him information to the contrary. Then there is always the possibility of new symptoms and possible diagnoses appearing. As one man puts it in referring to the continuous complaints of his wife who had been in the hospital on fourteen occasions, each time for a different ailment, "I don't see how one person can have so many things wrong with her and still keep living. I think she would either die or get well."

The origin of illness as an escape mechanism seems to grow out of a rather limited set of circumstances—frailty, and rank and order of birth. Because of an appearance of frailty the child may secure special consideration very early and be excused from small unpleasant tasks in which other members of the family engage. In the cases under consideration the escape-response pattern occurred more frequently where the individual was the youngest of the family or where he had the role of the youngest. Unable to carry over this role in situations outside the family, he works out a technique for retaining this earlier role in other groups. The infantile role is repressed because society demands that the individual grow up and assume adult responsibilities. This infantile role, forbidden to take direct expression, is allowed to continue, however, through the escape mechanism of illness.

Marriage for the individual who has met every difficult problem with some form of escape mechanism is the most difficult situation with which he has yet had to deal. From the standpoint of the woman this is aggravated in many cases by the fact that the marriage itself has been used as a device for escape from an experience which at the time seemed unbearable, such as an unsuccessful love affair or a tiresome job. Mar-

riage thus becomes a crisis situation for which the individual has no form of adjustment other than that of the escape response.

The phase of relations in which conflict first originates is that of sex. This is probably true because it is the earliest relationship demanding an adjustment. In the group studied it is quite uncommon to find a woman who prior to her marriage had any specific knowledge of sex relations. She often enters marriage with her attention upon the romantic aspects of the relationship rather than upon the physical. If the sexual phase of marriage has been discussed it was only done the day before the wedding. The writer has been told over and over again, "I knew nothing about sex. Why, I didn't even know how babies came." The first sex experience, therefore, is a shock for the girl who has thus been sheltered until the time of her marriage. The experience is distasteful to her. There is a natural rebellion against the pain and a repugnance toward the experience, which to her seems unrefined and coarse. This is quite in contrast to the reaction of her husband, whose sex experience not infrequently has begun prior to marriage. (See Chapter IX.)

Sex relations also soon become associated with children. Childbirth is looked upon as a painful experience and the care of the child afterwards as unromantic and unpleasant. There is a rebellion against the new role. The following is almost a typical attitude of the woman in such a situation:

"I didn't want a baby. I hated my first baby and at first I wouldn't take care of it. I felt hurt and disappointed at the whole thing. I felt that I was no more than a baby myself and that I should be in the baby's place, receiving the attention and petting. I missed all the petting that I had as a child. I felt jealous of the baby. Then I got tired of the whole thing. I never got any satisfaction out of it. My husband was always in a hurry to stay with me and get it over with. He seemed so unrefined. I never got any satisfaction. I talked to him about it but it was no use. I tried to give him his satisfaction; I never got mine. I got disgusted with it. Then I told him I was sick and that I couldn't stay with him."

The woman, therefore, who finds no opportunity to carry over her earlier role because it is in contradiction with the new

position given her in marriage looks about for some escape from the situation which is so repugnant to her. Sickness furnishes that escape and enables her to reinstate her earlier role in a socially approved way. She can maintain the position of wife and mother, and yet be excused from unpleasant responsibilities, by playing the role of an invalid. In certain cases the use of this escape mechanism seems to be quite conscious; in others almost or entirely unconscious.

If this situation could continue indefinitely, one might conclude that the individual is enabled through the escape-response pattern to work out a satisfactory adjustment. Such, however, is not the case. Pronounced sex conflict continues. In some instances, while lack of sex satisfaction on the part of the wife causes her to become more inhibited sexually, her natural sex impulses are stronger than at the time of marriage. Her resentment, then, because of her dissatisfaction becomes even greater. In other instances, the natural sex impulse has increased by removal of inhibitions, but conflict remains because of the fear of childbirth. The husband in some situations, because of the infrequency of sexual contact, finds it impossible to satisfy his wife. This only increases her resentment. In other situations the husband, believing that his wife is in reality too ill to have intercourse, engages in extra-marital relations.

Sex conflict usually passes over into a conflict in response relations. Differences in the nature of response demands soon become more clearly defined. The husband is spoken of as unromantic in all his attitudes. The wife becomes jealous of his attentions to the children and to any other member of his family. As a result she becomes more unreasonable in her demands for attention. In some instances she may even resort to attempts at suicide.

This type of domestic discord, while it may present pronounced conflict elements, rarely leads to complete disorganization of the family. That is to say, the husband usually assumes the attitude of a martyr remaining "faithful" to his semi-invalid wife. Nevertheless, he finds himself confused in his attitude toward her. While at times he believes her complaints to be

too numerous to have any organic basis, there still lurks a doubt that he may be misjudging her.

The case of Mrs. O. shows the most characteristic elements of this type of domestic-discord pattern: (1) the escape of the wife through illness, and (2) the ambivalent attitude of the husband, who at times feels that his wife is not ill and at other times is convinced that she is seriously ill.

Mr. O. grew up in Europe, coming to America at about the age of twenty. He was sent a ticket to come here by his uncle who lived in Chicago.

Mrs. O. was reared in Europe and came to America at the age of nineteen. She was sent a ticket by her brother who lived in Chicago.

FAMILY ORGANIZATION

Mr. O. was the youngest of a family of seven children—five boys and two girls. The children ranged widely in age, so that during most of Mr. O.'s childhood only one sister was in the home, the other children having married. Mr. O. was born just before his mother experienced menopause. Mr. O. says, "My parents were too old for me."

Mr. O. speaks of himself as the favorite child and says he slept with his parents until he was ten years old. The mother and father always got along well together. He admired his mother and felt closer to her than to the father. He was always a "delicate child" and "stayed to himself."

At one time Mr. O.'s parents were "making a nice comfortable living," but "when they got too old to work, they had difficulty." The father was a grain dealer and when Mr. O. was seventeen years old, he "started to handle the business." He often quarreled with his older brothers and sisters because he did not think they "treated the parents right." He says, "I thought they should all help. I always had more responsibility than they had. They did not care for the parents."

Mr. O.'s parents died in 1913. One brother is living in New York City; the remaining brothers and sisters are still in Europe. He sometimes hears from them. He says, "They want money all the

time and I am ashamed to tell them I haven't got it. I sent them \$10.00 recently."

Mrs. O. was the youngest of a family of eleven children, six of whom are living, two boys and four girls. The parents died during the World War. Two brothers were killed in the army. One brother is living in the United States; the remainder of the family is still in Europe.

Mrs. O.'s father owned a bakery and according to Mrs. O. employed "eight or ten clerks." Mrs. O. says, "I was brought up like silk. My mother and father got along good—never had any quarrels." One sister married a minister. This sister and brother-in-law were supported by Mrs. O.'s parents for six or seven years. The father was well educated. There were always servants in the house.

Mrs. O.'s mother was a "good business woman," and most of the care of Mrs. O. was left to the other girls in the family. Mrs. O. says, "I was the youngest and all the sisters kept me like a baby." She was the favorite child and was spoiled. She was close to her family and says, "My house was such a happy house that I didn't want to go anywhere; I wanted to be alone."

Mrs. O. was fond of both her parents, particularly her father. She was deeply fond of her brothers and sisters. She says that the entire family life centered around her. She was always addressed as "little sister." "Little sister must have the best. She must have the cream and fresh eggs to keep her healthy and have a nice time always."

During the World War Mrs. O. says that her father lost "everything," the bakery being taken over by the government. She says, "At that time we had enough to eat, but we had to do our own housework."

CULTURAL PATTERNS

Mr. O. attended school in Europe, where he learned two languages. He never attended night school in America, but learned to read and write English.

Mr. O. says he had "boy and girl friends" before his marriage. He enjoys a good time. He likes dances, lectures, and shows. He says, "I liked things that would help me." He was anxious to get ahead

financially and thought that by hard work he would succeed. He reads newspapers mostly.

Mrs. O. says she attended school for six years, learning Russian, German, and Polish. She was given religious training by a private teacher. Upon coming to America, she attended night school for about eight weeks.

Mrs. O.'s family were well off financially. There were servants in the home. She had "nice clothes" and was "always given the best of everything." She was fond of reading love stories and dramas. She says, "I was a big lover. I liked to be loved. My parents were strict and I never went with a boy, but I would imagine myself in love."

Before her marriage Mrs. O. worked in the packing room of a novelty company. She says, "I stood for ten hours with blisters on my feet. I wasn't used to it. I cried all the time." She "hardly had time to make friends" when she met Mr. O. and married him "because he was so good to her."

SOCIAL INTERACTION

A. *Factors in Adjustment and Conflict between Family and Community*

1. *Economic.* Upon coming to America, Mr. O. worked as a laborer, earning \$6.00 a week. Later he went to peddle vegetables and after about four years was earning \$60.00 a week. He says, "I spent \$10.00 on myself and saved the rest." After seven years he was able to save \$5,000.00, which he later lost when he established a fruit and vegetable store. After his business failure he went back to peddling part time and working in a fruit and vegetable store the remainder of the time. He says, "In the summer I make good and am able to put away and save for winter. In the winter I make \$16.00 and \$18.00 a week."

Mr. O. resents having to work for anyone. He says, "Maybe I am a little stubborn, but when I work for someone else I am a *slave* for someone else. Now I work for someone else part of the time and part of the time for myself—maybe I will get a business again."

2. *Health.* Mr. O. complains of no illness. He says, "My wife makes me to be nervous."

Mrs. O. complains of "spells," general weakness, choking sensations, and fear of riding in a moving vehicle alone. She has been under the care of various physicians. One physician diagnosed her as having a "fear of the open spaces."

3. *Sex.* Mr. O., although he married at the age of twenty-eight, says he had had no sex experience, believing "some day I would get my reward by keeping myself clean."

Mrs. O. had had no sex experience before marriage. She knew nothing of "sex matters." She says, "I was kept like a slave. Some girls had doings with the soldiers in my town, but I wasn't like that."

4. *Cultural.* Neither Mr. nor Mrs. O. belong to any clubs. Mr. O. belongs to a lodge, but does not attend the meetings because he says, "I cannot leave my wife alone." He says, "I am sociable, I like people. My wife is not sociable now. I know a lot of people, but I don't go to them, so they don't go to me. Nobody comes to my house."

5. *Pattern of Life.* Mrs. O. has always played the role of the spoiled child. She sees herself as a dependent. She craves attention and demands it through complaints of illness, "spells," refusal to go out alone, etc. She attempts to escape from difficult situations through "spells."

Mr. O. is intelligent and frank. He is slow in his reactions. His unhappiness almost overwhelms him. He impresses one as effeminate. He faces situations and is anxious for an adjustment.

B. *Factors in Adjustment and Conflict within Family Group*

1. *Economic.* Mrs. O. in the past has worried about her husband's business affairs. However, she has always been satisfied with his income. The economic factor has never played an important role in the domestic conflict. She says, "When I married him, he had money. He lost it. It aggravated me, but I am satisfied with what he makes. He is a good man about money. He knows I am not a spender."
2. *Health.* Mrs. O. complains of feeling too ill to do her housework and play the role of wife and mother. She does not like housework. She says she is too sick to go to shows, eat

with the rest of the family, and that reading makes her dizzy, etc. Her husband says he cannot understand her "sickness" as she "neither improves nor dies, but is always the same." She refuses to ride on street cars alone and continually refers to her "spells." (See Rationalizations for description of "spells.")

Mr. O. says, "If my wife would be healthy we would get along."

3. *Sex.* The couple did not have relations until ten days after marriage, Mr. O. explaining "matters of sex" to his wife. He says, "She knew so little; she didn't know how babies came." During the first year of marriage (after the first month) Mrs. O. enjoyed sexual relations.

The first pregnancy was difficult. Mrs. O. says she "labored for two days and had a doctor all night. The baby was delivered by instruments." Three months after the birth of the first child, Mrs. O. had her first "spell." During the first year of marriage the couple had relations on the average of three times a week. Later, during Mrs. O.'s pregnancy, the couple stayed together every night. As time went on Mrs. O. became more highly sexed than her husband. Whenever she failed to get satisfaction she would become very angry, sometimes pinch him; other times weep. Quarrels have always followed Mrs. O.'s coming home from the hospital after she has given birth to a child. Mr. O. refuses to have relations with her for three months after child birth, explaining to her that to do so is not good for her health. At times she begs him to engage in sexual play.

Mr. O. says that his wife never has "spells" of any kind during pregnancy.

Mrs. O. speaks very frankly of her strong sex drive. At first she desired relations every night; but, later, there was some diminution.

Mr. O. is practicing *coitus interruptus*.

4. *Cultural.* Mr. O. feels that his wife is intelligent and comes from a good family, but that her interest in anything is "like dead."

Mrs. O. says that she has no friends and cannot make any contacts, nor do any reading because of her "sickness." She objects to any outside activities on the part of her husband because she does not want to be left alone.

RATIONALIZATIONS

Mr. O. tells the following:

"I came here a few months before the war broke out. My uncle sent me a ticket. I paid him back \$2.50 a week. The first year I came I was sick in the hospital with fever and pneumonia. I had hard luck. I liked this country. I was free and I didn't grumble. I worked as a laborer and then I got to peddling. I spent \$10.00 on myself and saved the rest. I saved \$5,000.00. In one fruit and vegetable store I made, in the next I lost. I lost all I had. I didn't go bankrupt, but I quit. When I quit I went to work for someone else. Circumstances make you. If you are able you can do anything in the world. Maybe I will get my business back again.

"Eight years ago I met my wife through friends. She was new from Europe. She was nice looking—not so terrible nice looking—but I liked her personality and way. I wanted to marry a woman who would say, 'As much as we make, we will live happy.' I knew her five months. She was twenty-one. I was twenty-eight—almost twenty-nine. She was working. She lived with her brother. She came from a good family. I knew other girls. I married late. I came from Russia, a poor boy. I hadn't seen anything of this country. I wanted to prove to myself that I was good enough to make a living and after seven years I saved \$5,000.00. I didn't expect beauty out of life. I wanted a friend. I wanted to get married to a girl who was able to take things as they came. I wanted to have things. In Europe I didn't have it nice, and here I have been a slave. I wanted to get married and have things. She was an honest girl. I didn't want relations right away. I really loved her and I wanted her to be a girl for a while. The first few days before the wedding she was afraid and acted funny toward me. I thought I would be careful. I had it all thought out. Sometimes after the first night people don't like each other. I didn't want that she should lose all responsibility and not like married life, so I was careful. She had hot feelings. I was intelligent. She got stronger. I had never been with a woman. I thought I should keep my body good and I would get my reward. She knew so little. She used to ask me how does a child come. I explained it all to her. I was experienced about

books. I knew everything. She was small built. We used to live in a bedroom. We didn't go to housekeeping at first. When she had her baby she was so scared. A doctor was with her all night. Three months after that she had her first spell. She said she was frightened because she was told by a neighbor that a girl friend of hers had died of appendicitis. Her first spell happened at nine o'clock in the evening. I was in the front of the store. She started screaming saying she didn't feel good and that it choked her. I called a doctor. She said that was the first time she was nervous. Until then we got along. We may have done a little quarreling a few days before. I remember I tried to get her out of the house to take a walk. We weren't having relations. I told her we must wait three months, that it wasn't good for her health. She complained that she wanted satisfaction. When I stayed, I drew away. She would get so mad. She was worked up and felt disappointed. For two years then she had spells, more often at night before she went to sleep. I remember once she had a spell and I was at a meeting. A neighbor lady called me home. At first I called doctors, then I got used to them.

"Then she started feeling better. She got fat and stubborn. She weighed one hundred and fifty pounds. The more fat she got the more stubborn. When her first child was three and a half years old, she said she would like to have another baby. I saw that the baby was fat and husky. I felt like I would like to have a boy. The second child was much easier. With the first child she labored two days. With the second child everything was easier. It only took two hours. When she was pregnant we stayed together every night. She liked it. When she had her second baby she wanted to stay with me before three months. I told her we can't do it. Sometimes when we shouldn't stay together she asked me to play with her. She gets satisfaction then. When she gets no satisfaction she gets so mad and so mean like you owe her something. Then in about a month or six weeks she says, 'I don't feel good.' She turns away like disappointed. In two or three weeks she becomes nervous. I didn't pay attention to her. I couldn't act to her right.

"Then five months later she got pregnant. She was mad at me; she didn't want the pregnancy. She told me it was my fault. She was afraid to have an abortion. She never has spells when she is pregnant. It is always the same. When she has her child and comes home, she wants me to stay with her. I say we must wait three months. When she doesn't get satisfaction, she starts saying she is sick. She turns away, then she is nervous and has spells. These

other spells were a different kind. During the night she would kick me and tell me she didn't feel good. Or she hits her head and says she doesn't feel good. The last two years she says she gets no satisfaction. Once or twice a month is enough for me. She doesn't like me to use anything. She says, 'It kills her life.' The last year she has been worse. She says she is so nervous. When she drinks she catches her breath. She is frightened at everything. She takes a bite and eats alone. She doesn't want to sit at the table. She belongs to no club. She won't go anywhere. She wants to be in the dark. She has no friends. She talks to some neighbors. I never go to any meetings because I can't leave her alone. She doesn't want me to go anywhere. She doesn't want to read. She doesn't want to do housework. She hasn't any patience, I can see that. I can see that she does not feel right. She thinks she becomes nervous in a place when she sees a crowd. We fight all the time.

"My children are my whole pleasure. I am the luckiest man in the world when I am with my children. I want her to go to a show, all of us. She says she can't go. You know about the child—playing with papers and fire. Since she died I couldn't get over it. Since that time we fight more. I feel not to live with my wife. That was December 14th. I warned my wife that if she let the child play with a neighbor child there would be an accident. [The child's clothes caught fire and she burned to death.]

"I want to take her all over to the best doctors. I say to her why don't you want to be cured. She doesn't want to go to a doctor. I can't understand it. She had bad teeth. I took her to the dentist last year. She got as far as the chair and ran away. She doesn't care for anything. I show her sales and tell her to go and buy things for the children. I should be both the husband and wife.

"My wife makes me always sore. She says I am not good to her. She is so blind! She holds me for the worst. She doesn't want to listen to anything. She is not interested in anything. She has no interests. I am religious in a different way—I believe to be kindly and not to steal. I go to church sometimes.

"She complains all the time. I don't know what she likes. She never was interested in my business. She is a puzzle to me. In one way married life is happy if you find a wife who believes in as much as you make she is satisfied. Why can't she be satisfied? She has a little house and little children. We don't have to take from someone else. Not everyone can be rich. We have to get as much

as we can and be satisfied. If my wife would be happy—I would be satisfied. I have as much as I can afford. A bachelor has no life. If my wife would be healthy, we would get along. I tell her that, if she would be all right, I would take a little fruit store and put her in it. I would peddle part time and would give her a servant for \$8.00 a week. She could dress up with a nice little dress and apron. She says she doesn't want it. Her answer is like dead.

"She has no one here. If she had a fine house and relatives and they should take her out, she would improve. She should have everything done for her. Then maybe she would live happy; otherwise she has lost herself. I feel healthy, but she makes me not healthy to feel. If anything bothers the children, I have to make the appointment with the doctor for them. I said to my wife when the baby was in the hospital [here he referred to the baby recently burned in the accident], 'Maybe we should stay with the baby. She is only a baby, let me stay with her.' My wife said, 'No, I won't let you. I don't feel good. I am nervous myself.' I said, 'Maybe you would stay with her and I will take care of the children.' She said, 'No, I can't. I don't feel good; it chokes me.' Then when I went to the hospital she asked me why I had to stay at the hospital. She said, 'The baby will be all right, more all right than I am. My hand hurts.' I loved my baby. I couldn't say my wife is a bad wife to me because she doesn't treat the children any different than she does me.

"My wife is ten days overdue. She is afraid she is pregnant. I am afraid for her to have another child.

"She is a puzzle to me. I can't understand why a sick person won't go to a doctor. She was so pretty when I married her—so little and cute and such pretty teeth. I hate to see her lose them just because she won't go to a dentist."

Mrs. O. tells the following:

"I was the youngest. I was brought up too good. I am mad because they spoiled me too much. All the time we had servants. But my sisters they kept me like a baby. My house was such a happy house. I liked to be alone. I liked to fix stockings and be alone. I was strong. I was bright looking. I wasn't aggravated. I was a big lover, I thought I should marry a lover. I like to be loved. I had no worries. I had sisters and brothers in my own family. I liked to read German books—love stories. My father was so kind. My

father and mother were busy. The sisters, they looked after me. When the war came, I couldn't stand the life. The people said the Bolsheviks would come. My father lost everything in wartime. Two of my brothers were killed, but I didn't worry very much. We weren't in the war zone and everybody was the same. I thought it just had to happen. My brother was in Chicago. I wrote him and he sent me \$220.00 to come here. He wrote, 'My dear youngest sister—my little sister: Come here to our free country—America.'

"I thought, 'If I go there, the whole country will be jealous—Mr. B.'s youngest daughter goes to America.' My mother and father were fainting when I left. I hated to leave, but the Bolsheviks were robbers.

"I came to Chicago but I didn't think right away to go to work. During the war we had to do our own housework. We just made a living. The Government took over the bakery. We baked for the soldiers. We had enough to eat. When I traveled three months to get here, I was tired out and disappointed. My brother was making nice. He was in the tailoring business. But I wasn't happy here. I was a greenhorn. His child, twelve years old, laughed at me. My sister-in-law was like a sister, but after six or seven days she said, 'What is the matter? Why don't you look for a job?' I was tired out. I thought I should get a rest for a few weeks. My sister-in-law's uncle told me the same thing. I thought to myself, 'Was I ever told anything like that at home?' I cried to myself. Who else could I cry to? I thought how happy I was at home. Every spring I went to my brother. He had a mill in the country. He said, 'Little sister, you should drink the milk and cream and have a nice time.' I was not delicate but they wanted me to have a good time. It was always little sister—she should have the best. I wasn't used to work. I wasn't made for work. I loved the country. When I was sixteen, I was so happy and carefree. My sister-in-law's relatives owned a factory. They gave me a job. I stood ten hours with blisters on my feet. I wasn't brought up in this way. Here they get used to it. Here children are brought up to work. I wasn't used to work. I was lonesome all the time for home. I didn't make any friends; I hardly had anyone. Seven months after I was here I met my husband. I came over with a woman and two children. A relative of hers was a friend of my husband's. But there was someone else I met, too. On the way here, on the train, I met two brothers. There were quite a few girls from the same country besides the woman and two children I told you about. About this boy—one of the brothers. He could talk German. I was so happy

to hear German. How I like German! I liked him. He was some fellow! He was from Chicago. We got acquainted on the train. He told me to promise him I would look at no one else. I was afraid all the time. I was afraid to make any business with boys. I was brought up a slave. I gave him my address. I liked the way he talked. He was a traveling salesman. When I got to Chicago he wrote me. I answered him but he didn't answer. Then I got a letter from him. My sister-in-law thought I was such a lucky girl. I was married one month when he called me up. He didn't know I was married. He said he called me as soon as he got back to town. He was shocked. He wanted to see me, but I told him I would have to forget. Then one day, when I was walking on the street, I met him. I introduced him to my husband. Oh, he was such a man—so good looking. He stood so sad. It was terrible. Then once when we had the fruit store I saw him pass by. (My first child was six months old.) He passed by and said, 'My sweetheart is here.' I walked with him to the park. He said he was engaged. He was sorry that I had married. I was sorry too, but I had to forget. It doesn't hurt me. It is all over. But his parents were here. I would have had someone if I had married him.

"I knew my husband about three months. I liked him pretty good. My sister-in-law talked it into me. He was a nice quiet fellow. I wrote to his country, and they said he comes from a very nice family. I married him because he was nice—not a bum. He was so good to me. Anything in the world I wanted he gave me. I knew nothing about married life. Some girls from our town had stayed with soldiers. I wasn't like that. I didn't even know how a baby came. Just before I got married my sister-in-law told me a few things—just about what to expect. I was kind of sad because I knew what was going to happen. I was ashamed too. I was sad because I wouldn't be a girl any longer. But I can say that my husband was good to me. For two weeks I stayed a girl. Then after experiencing sex relations, I found I loved my husband. He made me a nice little home. I never liked a lot of people. He said, 'You and me, we will get along. We will be happy.' Three months later he bought a little store. We stored our furniture and went to a bedroom over the store.

"When my baby was born, I had a terrible time. I was three hours under ether. The whole street was talking about Mrs. O. I was built small. I had a private room. After the baby was born, I was weak. After that I had the spell. When I heard a friend of mine died, I started hollering. I couldn't get my breath. I think that

was about six or eight days after I came from the hospital. We were living in the back of the store. He was busy in the front. I started screaming. I hadn't lived with my husband since I came home. I felt weak. I had been washing diapers. I was discouraged. I was dizzy. There was ether in my face. I didn't care for anything. It killed me, it was so hard. Every day in the hospital patients came to look on me because I was such a case. I was very strong that I pulled through. They came to look on me like in a movie—that I had had the baby. I didn't feel as good as before, I felt pain, then dizzy all the year. The doctor said there was too much ether in me. I was lonesome. Sometimes I didn't have a letter from home and I would have a spell. Then I would think too much and have a spell.

“Four and a half years later I had my second child. Then I felt strong. For a year and a half I didn't have spells.

“I worried about everything. I was dissatisfied; I wanted better things. I am disappointed in life. There have been ups and downs. We have lost money. I know everybody has trouble, but I was mad at myself. Then I had a spell. Then I pushed everything away and I gained. When I got pregnant I felt fine. I got along pretty good. Then the kid was born. That time we had the store on the North Side. Business wasn't good. It wasn't hard having the second child. I felt good. When I came home I was upset. Everything went wrong. I thought it wasn't right that I had to work—that I had to prepare dinners and wash diapers. It worked on me having to do everything. I wasn't used to it.

“My husband gets through quickly. I imagine I don't get anything out of it. I don't finish. For two or three years he was through in a minute. I can't stand for him to use anything. It bothers me. Once a week now I would want it if I got any satisfaction. Maybe I should have another child. I would like one to take the place of the other. On the other hand, I don't want to go through nine months with it.

“I am stubborn. It was stubbornness that brought me to America. It was stubbornness that brought me into everything. I can't get out of my stubbornness.

“I used to go every night to a show in the neighborhood. Now it is three years since I have been to a show. I have nobody here [i.e., relatives]. I have a few friends, not many. I can't be in the house

alone. My heart is heavy. I think the child is walking around the house. My life is over. I don't like my sister-in-law. My husband talks with her. My brother likes my husband; he thinks he is wonderful.

"When I am nervous and sick, he doesn't look on me. When we were engaged, he was wonderful. I always was disappointed with married life. I shouldn't have married so soon. I am used to him. The children are crazy about the father. He is such a father. He loves the children. He is crazy about them. On account of him I would like to have another child. When I see him so sad, I feel so sorry for him. Maybe I would feel better if I had a baby. I am not exactly satisfied that I should have it, but maybe it would get my mind off of the accident. Sometimes he fights around. He is crazy to have another one. I am not pregnant now.

"I don't like housework. I keep my house clean. I have to like it. I can't read now, I get dizzy. I have no patience to read the paper. I can't sit still. I can't ride on street cars alone—that is my sickness."

Mrs. O., reared as a pampered child, early gets the idea that she is entitled to special attention and consideration. As the "little sister" in a family of seven children she is given the best of what the family has to offer. The only obstacle on the horizon so far as her early life is concerned appears when she is denied the friendship of boys, because of the strict discipline of her parents. This, however, is taken care of by building up a dream world in which she is loved by a dream lover.

Upon coming to America Mrs. O. anticipates the carrying over of the same important role she had known in her family group. She thinks of the jealousy which will be experienced by others as she, Mr. B.'s youngest daughter, arrives in America. Her first disappointment comes when she realizes that her role in America in the home of her sister-in-law is to be quite different. Work is suggested to her soon after her arrival, and it becomes obvious that she must shift for herself. Although she complains of feeling tired, this does not at this time furnish her an escape from the situation. Work proves unbearable to her. She notices that she has lost all her importance; Mr. B.'s youngest daughter has become a drudge. Mrs. O. rebels, complaining

that she is not meant for work. She hates her new role, which is contrary to her early rearing. Then she looks about for an escape and finds it in marriage. While her marriage is not to the "dream lover" she would have chosen, she feels that he will shower her with attention and be good to her.

Again Mrs. O. meets with disappointment when she is unable to carry over the role of the pampered child. Marriage, which she first looked upon as a romantic experience, is in reality unbearable. Sex relations, for which she has had so little preparation, become associated with childbirth, which is a painful experience. Unable to secure the attention from her husband which she craves, she resorts to attempts at exaggerating the experience of childbirth. She describes her case as the most difficult one in the hospital and thus secures the attention of all her neighbors. She resents having to take care of her baby and hates house work. As a wife and mother certain duties and responsibilities are expected of her. Attention is demanded from her rather than given to her. It becomes impossible for her to reinstate the earlier role in the face of disapproval of everyone about her. But, through repression, this role gains expression in another way. Thus Mrs. O. is soon seen attempting to carry over the "little sister" role through "spells" and complaints of sickness. For a time she secures attention and escapes from difficult situations in this way.

Conflict in response relations appears in an exaggerated form. There is early in the marriage a lack of sexual satisfaction due in part to a breakdown in the wife's inhibitions regarding sex, which results in a strengthening of her sex impulse so that it surpasses that of her husband. The decline in the husband's sexual desire and his practice of *coitus interruptus* also aggravates the situation. Mrs. O. experiences conflict between her natural sex impulse, increased by removal of inhibitions, and the fear of childbirth. Sex response grows more and more important as a form of attention. As time goes on, Mrs. O. attempts to isolate her husband, allowing him no outside contacts. She becomes jealous of his attentions to the children. She makes increased sex demands as a substitute for other forms

of response. She demands attention through her "spells." She attempts to continue her infantile role by refusing to ride alone on street cars. Her refusals to see physicians and dentists and her desire not to eat at the table are manifestations of the same behavior pattern. Even when her child is in the hospital dying, she remains home nursing her own slight injury, jealous of her husband's attention to the child.

While women often endeavor, ~~as~~ ^{like} Mrs. O., to reinstate their earlier roles, men also make the same attempt but in a somewhat different way. This difference grows out of certain cultural patterns organized along sex lines. A man who is forced by society to assume responsibilities for which he has had no preparation would, like the woman, prefer to escape them. Society, however, does not so easily permit him to do so. A woman who does not like to work can fall back upon a traditionally sanctioned form of behavior, that is, marriage. Women have been traditionally excused from work outside the home. While marriage for many means responsibility, for the upper class it means leisure and freedom from any sort of work. The woman who marries to escape work thinks of marriage in terms of this more fortunate group rather than in terms of her own social class. Marriage becomes a convenient exit from labor. But for men there are no such conventionally sanctioned exits. So the man goes on, but makes a low type of adjustment—his work is uninteresting and he only does it from compulsion. He later marries, the result being added responsibility which he has not foreseen. Thus the urge to escape is increased by marriage rather than decreased. Added to this, certain exaggerated stresses and strains appear which result in economic and sex conflict. Many times in such situations the wife assumes a more dominant position which aggravates the husband's feeling of inferiority and dissatisfaction. The wife's attitude becomes reflected in the attitudes of the children toward the father. The result is that he feels that he lacks the respect which is normally accorded the father—an added element of irritation in the situation. Out of this complex of conflicting elements the man tends to find some avenue of escape, of which, of course, illness is only one.

Illness is not so frequently used as an escape for men, chiefly because of its implication of lack of vitality, which has become traditionally associated with masculine behavior. The tendency, therefore, is to turn to escapes which are traditionally masculine, such as drink, narcotics, and forms of antisocial behavior.

CHAPTER VII

DRINK AS AN ESCAPE MECHANISM

Drink as an escape mechanism has in the past been little understood, whether with reference to the tippling proclivities of one's friends, or the "demon" which disorganizes families. Yet chronic and excessive drinking is perhaps one of the most reliable symptoms of personality maladjustment.

The traditional attitude toward drinking is that it is a bad habit which one falls into either because of some inherent liking for liquor or because of the influence of bad companions. Therefore, the individual must be made to realize his sin and induced by an act of will to break the habit.

In some quarters this outlook has been modified by the realization that habits have their physiological bases, and it is upon such assumptions as these that so-called drink cures have been developed. These cures, however, have been largely unsuccessful, owing to the failure to recognize another probably more fundamental function of drinking, namely, as providing an avenue of escape.

Drink as an escape mechanism is not uncommon. In these situations the drinking always expresses the desire to escape critical situations in one's life over which the individual has no control. The man who becomes despondent often drinks to forget his despondency. In such cases drinking produces an elevation of one's attitudes due to the physiological changes which facilitate repression of those things which have created his despondency. The man who loses his job, for example, gets drunk rather than face the fact that he is without work. Or a father whose children are without food sometimes gets drunk rather than face this situation. Again the husband who suddenly

loses his wife, of whom he is very fond, often takes to drink. The artificial elation resulting from drinking enables him to forget his loss and his grief.

This resort to drink as an escape from the problems of life is illustrated in the words of a habitual drinker as follows:

"I have been drinking every day for the last three years. I haven't the patience to stand things. Drinking eases my mind. I don't drink because I want it. Some days I would drown myself—I feel so bad. Instead I take a drink and I feel good."

Another variation in the type of drinking is seen in the instances of men who drink to overcome a feeling of inferiority. Since inferiority is a matter of social status, the individual may drink with other people in order to enhance his status in social situations. Or he may drink alone, and with the resulting stimulation he may be enabled to make the contacts which he feels are desirable. Some men are known to drink only when in the presence of others—on festive occasions, at the home of friends, etc. Others show a history of drinking alone—just before endeavoring "to put over a big deal" or before meeting any difficult situation. Thus the writer has been told on numerous occasions:

"I took a drink just before I came to be interviewed. I expected to be told I was no good, so I took a drink to make me feel I am somebody."

Inasmuch as drinking does represent a release from repression, it means not the building up of new responses, antisocial or otherwise, but the release of those which are already present, which, in the interest of avoiding conflict with society, have been repressed. This is somewhat at variance to the common-sense point of view which assumes that drunkenness produces a certain type of standardized behavior. It is often assumed, for example, that the taciturn person will always become garrulous; the shy individual, bold, etc. Quite on the contrary, the personality does not become fundamentally changed under the influence of drink. If no phase of the personality is garrulous,

then the individual will not become garrulous; the taciturn individual under the influence of liquor may become more taciturn. Garrulousness is a trait of only a certain type of personality.

In other words, drink enables the individual to reinstate an earlier role. If he has suffered a loss of status due to his inability to carry over a superior role, particularly from the family group, he is able to reinstate this more important role when under the influence of liquor.¹ At such times he becomes argumentative, challenging the views of his intellectual superiors and boastful of his accomplishments. If an individual is known intimately, therefore, in terms of his dominant role it is not difficult to predict how he will react when drinking.

The man who uses drink as an escape mechanism is not infrequently found to have used other means of escape earlier. It is not uncommon, also, to find the use of other means of escape along with drink. Thus a man said to be cured of drinking was soon attempting suicide. There seems, in fact, to be no inherent reason why drink tends to follow other escape mechanisms, but in present-day society traditional control precludes a child from drinking at an early age, although other escape mechanisms are open to him, such as illness, phantasy, various forms of delinquency, development of dilatory behavior, etc.

Social regulation also makes drinking a more common escape among men. While women often consume alcoholic beverages, there exists in most groups, at least, a widespread taboo against their becoming excessively drunk. Even in this age of changing feminine fashions, the heavy drinking of liquor still remains a masculine prerogative.

Drink, however, is not a wholly satisfactory escape to the man, as is illness to the woman, since the attitudes of society are contradictory. While it is true that drinking is in the

¹Superiority may be achieved also by attracting attention through behavior which calls out family disapproval. In this way the child receives attention and solicitude which otherwise he would not get. The result is that, whereas it may seem on the surface that the position of the child is inferior, he actually achieves a preferred position through his disregard of the mores of his family.

folkways, there is the implication that one does not entirely escape his obligations while drunk. Furthermore, many groups, if they do not condemn drinking as highly undesirable, at least look upon it as a cowardly way of escaping responsibilities. The individual who drinks, therefore, to escape his problems finds himself in a paradoxical situation upon recovering from drunkenness. In the first place his situation has remained unchanged, and secondly, he tends to feel a further loss of status, having resorted to a technique which lacks social sanction and which carries a certain amount of condemnation. Since marriage provides a series of crisis situations, the individual who has attempted to solve his problems through escapes tends to meet the demands for adjustment in marriage relations in the same way. Accordingly, any one or all of a number of escape mechanisms may be used, as was pointed out in Chapter VI. Where drink is used, the marriage situation becomes highly complicated.

One of the complications which arise out of the use of drink as an escape, for example, is economic conflict. While in some instances a man may be able to confine his drinking to week ends, this is not always the case. If he drinks excessively during the day, he must lose time from work. The inevitable result is that the employer soon regards his employee as incompetent and dismisses him. Even should he later find an employer who is quite tolerant in his attitude, frequent loss of time necessarily results in a reduction of earnings. Such a financial situation usually provides the wife with a means of rationalizing her attitudes toward her husband, even though she is willing, for the time being, to lower her standards of living. In cases of excessive drunkenness the wife is often forced to go to work in order to support her children. Otherwise the family becomes dependent upon charity.

Further complications result from the fact that conflict tends to appear, also, to an exaggerated degree between the children and the father. There are situations where the father attempts to control his children only while he is under the influence of alcohol. At such times he asserts his dominance, even resorting

to physical punishment. The children look upon him with fear and disgust. Furthermore, they may feel keenly the loss of status due to the presence in the home of a "drunken father," for as such he is often spoken of by neighbors.

Sex conflict likewise tends to exist in various intensities. A wife, feeling disgust toward her husband, may carry over this attitude into their sexual relationship. The result is that she refuses to have sexual intercourse with him, at the same time resenting the fact that she feels compelled to decline. In other situations the husband may, when under the influence of liquor, attempt to practice sexual perversions which further outrage and antagonize the wife. In still other instances, sexual impotency may result from chronic alcoholism, though the wife has little understanding of the true nature of such situations.

This type of domestic discord is further characterized by frequent breakdowns in family unity, in the form of desertions and separations. The husband, unable to face his family after a prolonged period of excessive drinking and quarreling, may disappear for a few days or even weeks. Upon his return home a reconciliation takes place which often becomes a dramatic event in which the husband and wife "weep and make up." Conflict, for the time, becomes minimized. The husband in many instances looks forward to such events. Thus desertion too, like drink, becomes an escape mechanism. It is the technique by which the husband secures momentary peace in the home upon his return and a certain amount of personal satisfaction and triumph over his wife.

In other instances the wife, feeling that she cannot endure the situation any longer, leaves her husband. This step is usually only a gesture. While the wife may see herself able to break off contact with her husband temporarily, it is merely an attempt to attract his attention, force him to realize her worth, and thereby "make him give up drink." Not infrequently it is the only drastic technique she has at her command in her attempt to control the situation. These separations, like the husband's desertion, are usually followed by a reconciliation at which time the husband promises "never to drink again."

In this type of domestic discord the wife's attitude is usually vacillating. She remains cognizant of the husband's pleasant personality while he is sober. She, like her husband, is in a paradoxical situation. She is ever ready to fasten hope upon her husband's determination and pledge to "throw away the bottle." She is inclined to criticise him, yet he arouses her sympathy and a maternal feeling for him.

The use of drink as an escape and the complications which follow are graphically shown in the case of Mr. R.:

Mr. R. was born in Europe, coming to America with his parents at about the age of fifteen.

Mrs. R. was born in Europe, coming to America with her parents at the age of eleven years.

FAMILY ORGANIZATION

Mr. R. was an only child. He says his parents got along fairly well financially. His father was a wagon maker. Mr. R. speaks of his childhood as being happy. He was "healthy and fond of the out of doors."

Mr. R. says that he was fond of his mother, but often had difficulty with his father. The father was "hot-tempered and often punished" him. On these occasions the mother "kept her place although she would have liked to interfere." She always made excuses for him. In a crisis Mr. R. could always depend upon his parents' financial support. For example, he says, "I left my job. I didn't have to keep it. I had my parents to take care of me." He was pampered on the one hand and disciplined on the other. He early learned how to "work" his parents and get his own way. He shows an emotional attachment and dependency, particularly in regard to his mother.

Mrs. R. was the youngest of a family of five children—four girls and one boy. One sister is living in Chicago, the remainder of the family in the East. The father died fourteen years ago. The mother has remarried.

Mrs. R. says that her mother and father always got along well together. The children were "all fond of each other." The brother and an older sister first came to America, then sending for the father. Three months later the father sent for the remainder of the family. Mrs. R. says, "My brother and sister and father had our whole home

furnished for us when we got here." When the father became ill, the older children worked and maintained the home.

Mrs. R. now hears from her mother every two weeks.

CULTURAL PATTERNS

Mr. R. attended school in Europe, learning two languages. He attended night school in America.

Mr. R. says he was always a "good sport" and made friends easily. He was fond of good music and of shows. He read works of Karl Marx and Tolstoy. He belonged to the "Young People's Socialist Group," but lost interest, he says, because "they had too many parties and I was too serious."

Mr. R. was radical in his whole point of view. He did not believe in a marriage ceremony, but "went through with it for the sake of his parents." His parents were not Orthodox, but followed some religious observances.

Mr. R. reads only newspapers, having lost all his earlier interest in books.

Mrs. R.'s parents were "religious and strict, but they liked young people." In Europe they lived in an industrial community, and the father was a weaver. Mrs. R. attended school in Europe, learning German and Russian. When she came to America, she was placed in the fourth grade and continued school until the eighth grade when her father became ill and she was forced to go to work. She was then fifteen years of age. She worked as a saleswoman in a department store for \$8.00 a week.

Mrs. R. was fond of dances and the theater. She read love stories and newspapers. She belonged to a social club where she met boys—mostly students.

SOCIAL INTERACTION

A. Factors in Adjustment and Conflict between Family and Community

1. *Economic.* Mr. R. first worked as an errand boy for a novelty company at \$2.50 a week. After three months he worked for a clothing firm as an errand boy. While there he learned

to operate a machine and later earned \$30.00 a week. He remained one and a half years, until the strike of 1910 in which he became involved. He left "because he was too radical," going to New York. While there he learned the trade of cigarmaker. Through friends who belonged to the cigarmaker's trade he became an apprentice, earning \$4.00 a week. After three months in New York, he returned to Chicago and joined the Cigarmakers' Union. He says, "I lied to get into the Union. I said I had three years' experience when I only had three months. I made my friends back me up."

Mr. R. worked in a cigar factory for eight years. Then he went into business with a cousin and established a cigar store in a suburb. From his mother he secured \$300.00. The business failed. During the past seven years Mr. R. has worked as a laundry driver. Because of drinking more heavily, he has not been able to hold a job for any length of time. In the past he drank only "now and then," but during the past three or four years he drank so frequently during the day that he was often incapacitated from work.

At one time Mr. R. was active in the Cigarmakers' Union. He was secretary of a local shop, and oftentimes as large a sum as \$200.00 was in his control. The group was composed of about one hundred and fifty men, "who liked him and voted for him over and over again." On one occasion, eight years ago, he suddenly left town, going west, taking a part of the funds with him. Part of the money he had spent and part was still in his possession when he was found and arrested. He settled in court and lost his standing in the union. After this experience, because Mrs. R. was ashamed to face people because her husband stole, the couple moved to the West. Mr. R.'s parents gave him \$1000.00 and he started a cigar shop. "He drank and lost all his money in the venture."

Mrs. R. is now working as a saleslady in a department store. She at first earned \$2.50 a day. Now she is on a six per cent commission basis. Mr. R. is not working.

2. *Health.* Neither Mr. nor Mrs. R. complains of illness.
3. *Sex.* Mr. R. had his first sex experience with prostitutes, at the age of seventeen. This continued until his marriage. He

contracted gonorrhea, but says that "after six months I was cured."

4. *Cultural.* Mr. R. says he always had friends and was sociable.

Mr. R.'s idea of religion is "to do good." He believes in an "Almighty in Nature."

He has always had a desire to participate in a radical group. He early belonged to a radical party, but later left and joined another group, because "they called themselves more radical." When he learned that they were not ultraradical, he left. He says, "Now I belong to no party. I am not in sympathy with anything. I am like a fish without water."

Mr. R. says that he first began to drink heavily when he went into the cigar business. This was before prohibition. For a short time he went out as a salesman. Much of his business was done with saloonkeepers. In order to show that he was a "good fellow," in an effort to solicit business he would take a drink.

5. *Pattern of Life.* Mr. R. is emotionally dependent both upon his family and wife. He has a certain amount of facile verbalization. He is on the "defensive," and at times quite argumentative. (This may be due to the fact that he is usually under the influence of liquor.) He has built up a protective armor of rationalizations. The dramatic appeals to him, and at times he makes "grandstand appeals." He has a definite feeling of inferiority.

Mrs. R. is frank and straightforward. She faces the situation and sees no solution. She has a certain emotional attachment for her husband, but is becoming more and more embittered. She seems adaptable.

3. *Factors in Adjustment and Conflict within Family Group*

1. *Economic.* Mrs. R. thinks her husband earned about \$40.00 in the past, although he always told her he made less—\$20.00 and \$28.00 a week. She has never at any time seen his pay check. Mr. R. says he earned \$36.00 a week.

Mrs. R. says that from the beginning of their married life Mr. R. never gave her what he made. She says, "I realized after

the first baby that things were not going to be right, but my mother told me I would have to make the best of it."

There have been frequent financial crises. At these times Mr. R.'s parents always assisted.

2. *Health.* Mrs. R. complains that her husband is "nervous and weak."
3. *Sex.* Couple had relations the first night, on which occasion Mr. R. says he learned his wife was not a virgin.

Mr. and Mrs. R. say that they both were strong sexually during the early part of their married life. They often desired relations twice a night. Mr. R. says that they have had relations sometimes both night and morning.

During the past five years there has been intensive sexual conflict. Mrs. R. has told her husband that he does not satisfy her. Recognizing this, Mr. R. makes every effort to have relations with her but with little success. Mrs. R. believes her husband is fast becoming impotent.

During this period Mr. R. has grown more and more jealous of his wife, oftentimes accusing her of relations with other men. For a period of ten or twelve years he practiced *coitus interruptus*. For the past two years he says that he has not been using any precautions (without his wife's knowledge), and points out that this proves that his wife wears a contraceptive device to protect her in her relations with other men; otherwise she would have become pregnant.

Mrs. R. believes her husband to be impotent as a result of his excessive drinking over a period of years. Mr. R. says that for the past two or three years he has felt inferior sexually and often remarks to his wife, "I suppose you have someone else better than me." Mrs. R. says that she has grown thoroughly disgusted with her husband's inability to satisfy her sexually. His accusations of infidelity, etc., are quite typical of a feeling of impotency and inferiority.

4. *Cultural.* In the past, couple have always gone out together on Sundays, while Mr. R. has gone alone during the week. During the past five years, however, Mr. R. has been more

inclined to go with his wife on all occasions, implying that if he left her alone she would have contacts with other men.

Mr. R. says that he is more intelligent than his wife. "Why, I got her to read. She never used to even read papers."

There are frequent quarrels over Mr. R.'s drinking. Mrs. R. says, "There is nothing more disgusting than a drunk man. I can't stand him."

RATIONALIZATIONS

Mr. R. tells the following:

"I always got along. I got jobs and I got mixed up with a strike. I lost my job because I was with the strikers. I was too radical; they wouldn't have me. But I didn't have to stay because I had my father and mother. They could take care of me. They always helped me out. I used to think I was a good sport. People liked me. I wanted to be radical. I belonged to the Socialist Party, but I was always looking for something more radical. I was business agent of the union. I organized the boys. I helped them out plenty. I gave speeches and I fought against Foster when he tried to take our local away from the international union. I wasn't religious. I believe in doing good. I didn't believe in a marriage ceremony. I went to prostitutes when I was seventeen.

"I met my wife at a dance. The radical group gave a dance. She was working in a department store at that time. I danced with her. I liked girl acquaintances, but I had no one girl. It was love at first sight. I knew her a year. I liked her family. I was romantic. I loved her and wanted to marry her. We got married. Then I found out something. It didn't matter much. I found out that she was not a virgin. Even her mother was watching to see if she was a virgin. That was my first experience with any woman except a prostitute. I had had gonorrhea, but I was cured. We were both strong. We didn't have any trouble about that. During the last couple of years [four or five] my wife told me that I don't satisfy her. I stay with her and say, 'Aren't you satisfied now? Don't you feel this time I satisfied you?' She says nothing and acts different. I think she has someone else. She makes me jealous. Someone else must be satisfying her. She tells me that the house detective waited for her and wanted to take her out.

"Things have been against me. I have been discouraged. For ten years we got along pretty good, but yet I have had so much in my heart. I owe the Union money. I can't get anywhere.

"The oldest girl doesn't talk to me. Her mother has told her not to. That has been going on for five months.

"When I drink I feel good. I started drinking too much when I was selling cigars. I had to do it in the business. I would drink and then make sales.

"I like my wife. She tells me she hates me. Everything is against you when you are not working and are discouraged. My parents don't want to see me. No one used to know me as a drinking man. Several times I got so discouraged I planned to commit suicide. When no one cares for you, you get pretty discouraged. I would like someone to bring us together. I will get work if things aren't against me. I don't drink so much—just now and then."

Mrs. R. tells the following:

"Both my mother and father were good to me. They were nice, sensible people. They were good to all of us. As a girl I had some acquaintances, but I had just one real chum.

"I met my husband when I was working at a department store. I was not quite eighteen and he was five years older. My mother liked him. I was afraid that he was spoiled since he was an only child. His mother claimed that he wasn't a steady worker, but I thought he was going to be a good husband. He was good-natured and would do almost anything for anyone. His parents gave him money to be in business in a cigar shop. He didn't want to be a working man.

"We got married. In two months I got in the family way. We got along, but even the first year wasn't just right. The baby was two days old when he came home drunk.

"We were both strong, but the last five years he has been less strong. He says he is weak from protecting so long. He tries to satisfy me, but he can't. I am just as strong as ever. He is weak and perspires all the time. We got along all right when he was strong. Five years ago he started getting weak—all the time weaker.

"The oldest child worries. She says she hopes the father will leave us—that we would be better off. She is ashamed of him. She is

against him. They like him because he is their father, but they have no use for him. He seems to care for the children. The girl is a big girl, but she can't bring anyone to the house. She is ashamed of her father.

"He never had any other women since we got married. Before we were married he was not an innocent boy. He used to go to see women. He is a selfish person.

"For the last seven years he hasn't been able to keep a job. He worked for two years for a laundry, but he can't keep a job because of drink. They won't stand for that on the road. He drinks during business hours. He borrows \$5.00 here and there.

"He doesn't sleep at night. He is restless. If he is not drunk, he is capable of sitting down and talking. He was always affectionate. He says he loves me. He kisses me. If there is nothing in the house to eat, a kiss doesn't go very far.

"I thought when I married that I would have a husband in business. He was sociable and nice. I didn't expect any riches. I thought he was a nice man. I didn't ask him to buy me diamonds or furs, but he started in wrong. It wasn't right. He lied to me. He didn't give me all he made. I realized after the first baby that things weren't going to be right. My mother said, 'Try, just the same.' I wasted my life on nothing. She told me to give him another chance. She is a lovely mother, but she never did the right thing by me, telling me to stay. My mother thought he would get better maybe in another year. I was crazy about his mother and father. They were so honest. All the time they gave him a lift. If he had had anything in him, he would have gone ahead. After he stole the money from the union, I was ashamed to face people. It didn't seem to affect him. His folks gave him \$1000.00. He went west and started a cigar store. Then his parents went out. Everybody liked him. They thought Homer was a fine fellow. At first he didn't drink. Then he started and lost everything. His folks—I am crazy about his folks—they scold him. They were always scolding him. It never did any good. I tried to help him in his business. I kept it as clean as gold. I always tried.

"When I see him drunk I can't eat, I can't sleep, it frightens me. There is nothing so bad as a man who drinks. I am working, but we can't get along on what I make. He can't keep a job. His parents are lovely. If it hadn't been for them, I would have left him long

ago. I feel sorry for him at times. I give him a lift, but I can't do anything with him. His parents are disgusted. They don't want to see him any more. I try to keep up appearances. To hold my job I have to make myself look good. I don't know what to do. I don't think he will be any different. I have stood it so long. It is a shame for the children."

Mr. R., as an only child, is pampered on one hand and disciplined on the other. His mother always protects him and gives him an excessive amount of attention. His parents' financial support early furnished him an escape from work. He boasts that he does not have to keep a job, as his parents can take care of him.

Mr. R. early develops a "get-by" technique which is effective with his parents. He endeavors to carry this attitude over into other groups. For a time he is able to do this with a fair degree of success. He falsifies his qualifications for admission to a union and, shortly afterward, holds an important position in the organization. For a time at least his personality does not feel any deflation. He is seen, however, endeavoring to gain importance and attention by joining a radical group. He boasts that he is unable to find a group which is radical enough for him and so moves from one group to another. He is spoken of as a "good sport" and is well-liked. Then while he is in a position of confidence in the union he absconds with the funds. He is arrested. The matter is settled and Mr. R. loses his standing in the union. Consequently he feels a definite loss of status.

After this episode Mr. R. leaves town, moving to another part of the country. His parents come to his aid by starting him in the cigar business. He evidently finds it difficult to recover his former status. His business necessitates his dealing, among others, with saloonkeepers. By taking a drink he is not only better able to play the part of the "good fellow," thus securing the good will of his prospective customers, but he finds that drinking gives him confidence in himself. He can take a drink and then go out and make a sale. On such occasions his more important role, which he had lost, is once more reinstated.

And since drink produces a physiological effect it is all the more convenient as a device for reinstating this earlier role.

For Mr. R. the marriage relationship is full of crises. There are periods during which he is able to support his family quite adequately; at other times he looks to his parents for support. Loss of good standing in his union and failure in business necessitate a change of occupation. He becomes a laundry driver. His drinking continues, becoming more excessive. As a result he is frequently incapacitated for work. Economic conflict becomes intensified and Mrs. R. goes to work.

Sex conflict in an exaggerated degree has existed through a period of five years. Mrs. R.'s sex impulse is stronger than her husband's. When under the influence of alcohol Mr. R. is sexually impotent.¹ In addition there are certain psychological factors contributing to the impotency—a marked feeling of inferiority, heightened by the wife's attitude, "You are weak, you are no longer a man." Mrs. R. has no knowledge of the subtle conflicts in the situation, and on each occasion of sexual contact with her husband feels the utmost disgust for him. Mr. R. finds himself in the paradoxical situation of drinking to escape his feeling of inferiority and sexual impotency; and yet contributing to both through his chronic alcoholism.

Mr. R.'s accusations of infidelity against his wife are typical of his feeling of impotency and inability to satisfy her. He projects his feeling of inadequacy upon her, insisting that she must have "someone else."

Mrs. R., in spite of disgust with Mr. R., is ever ready to try to help him. On several occasions she has separated from him only to return to him again. Upon two occasions these reconciliations resulted from attempts at suicide on the part of Mr. R. This solicitous attitude on the part of Mrs. R. is, in fact, typical of such cases.

Escape through drink thus represents an attempt to reinstate an earlier role which has been suppressed. With the aid of stimulants the individual is able to achieve the more pref-

¹One notes a venereal infection early before marriage. A physical examination, however, showed no evidence of a residual gonorrheal prostatitis.

erable position which he occupied in his earlier family relations but which society has subsequently denied him. This achievement, however, is a precarious one which the individual himself condemns.

While to some individuals the earlier role is so attractive that they are constantly striving to maintain the same position in every group, there are others who strive to escape their earlier roles. In these latter cases the escape mechanism provides a device by which the individual is able to reconstruct his role in accordance with a pattern superior to that countenanced in the family group.

CHAPTER VIII

PHANTASY AND DOMESTIC DISCORD

When the individual's role is not a satisfactory one, he often takes steps to attain a more satisfactory role within the environment of his social world. He definitely sets out to develop the inferior trait or some substitute trait to compensate for his feeling of inadequacy.¹ This method of realizing goals is not the only one available. In many cases the individual turns from this more objective form of adjustment to a more subjective one. Two of these escapes, namely, illness and drink have already been analyzed, but there remains a third device, namely, that of phantasy.

While illness, drink, and phantasy all represent mechanisms for realizing a more satisfactory adjustment to the environment, as avenues of escape, they are not entirely alike. Illness and drink seem to be devices used by individuals who have earlier played enviable or superior roles in the family group, but who have not been able, at least satisfactorily, to carry over this role into the community. By resort to illness and drink, the earlier role is indirectly either completely or partially reinstated.

On the other hand, the use of phantasy seems to grow out of the dissatisfaction with the early family role which has not been materially changed in adult life. That is to say, the individual attempts to realize a more desirable role by constructing in his imagination a world in which the desired role may be attained.

¹Compensation, it is assumed, is a normal process since it is positively directed, and ordinarily does not lead to disorganization except in cases of over-compensation. In over-compensation the inferior trait is developed to the detriment of other aspects of the individual. Thus the delicate child becomes athletic to such an extent that he impairs his heart, and the timid individual becomes so aggressive as to offend those about him. See Adler, *The Neurotic Constitution*.

There are, in general, two forms which phantasy takes. The first of these is the imaginative reconstruction of the environment in such form that the individual can realize the desired role. This type of adjustment is to be seen in daydreaming, lying, and perhaps even in storytelling, production of art forms, etc. Daydreaming and related responses result chiefly in passive adjustments through mental activity.

A second form of phantasy is the identification of one's self with another individual, either real or imaginary, so that one expresses his ambitions, his successes, and his joys, as if they were his own. This form differs from the first in that the individual is active in realizing the ideal role but this is made possible, of course, by setting the stage in accordance with his desires. He is able to achieve the desired role, therefore, only by interpreting his environment as well as his own traits from a basis peculiar to himself.

This reconstruction of the environment through phantasy to suit one's desires is not an uncommon device in behavior generally considered normal. All of us project our wishes into the future, at some time or other. We see our ambitions realized and ourselves successful. The office boy, for example, sees himself as a great business executive; the file clerk sees herself as the wife of a handsome millionaire.

This type of phantasying tends to be on the whole, a form of daydreaming. But it may easily pass over into identification as when the office boy not only imaginatively takes the role of his employer but also develops certain of his employer's mannerisms, or when the file clerk pretends to her girl friends that the chap to whom she is engaged is a millionaire.

Another common illustration of the same mechanism to be found in everyday life is that of idealization. The individual, finding the world not wholly to his liking, selects out those aspects which are congenial and reacts toward them as though they were the whole of experience.

Much of phantasy is, therefore, a normal experience, since the individual is at least partially aware that he is daydreaming and does not altogether lose touch with reality. It is only with

the disappearance of this recognition that the reconstructed world is somehow more a part of ourselves than of objective reality that problems arise in the adjustment of the individual.

The origin of phantasy as an escape mechanism arises out of a number of family situations, of which the following three seem to be particularly important: first, that in which the child is unwanted; second, that in which the child has an orphan role; and, third, those conditions under which the child's role is uncertain and fluctuating, because of different attitudes on the part of each parent toward the child.

The child may very early sense the fact that he is unwanted. He interprets, therefore, any attitudes of favoritism he sees displayed toward the other children in the family, in this light. If there exists exaggerated discrimination against one child he may get the idea that one parent is not his real parent after all. Such a situation is illustrated in the following document:

"I was the oldest of a family of six children—four boys and two girls. When I was six years old, a brother was born, who lived about two and a half years. I liked him but felt jealous of him and hurt because my mother paid so much attention to him, giving him special things. When he died, I overheard my mother tell a friend, "If it had to be, I wish it had been Mary instead of Robert." My mother always wanted me to be in her house and help like a maid. I had to wear my cousin's old clothes. My mother used to hit me, and the neighbors used to remark and say I certainly couldn't be her child. I often wondered if she really was my mother and asked my father about it.

"When I got older, I tried to dress up. When I would buy things to wear, she would take them away from me. I remember once I bought a shirtwaist and invited some girls to the house. My mother came out wearing the shirtwaist. She was always jealous of me.

"Girls were afraid to come to my house on account of my mother. I didn't have a place I could call a home. Whenever I had a chance I read books, mostly love stories. I liked to live in a dream world. I remember reading *The Fighting Chance*. It made a great impression upon me. Whenever my mother found my books she burned them. I was romantic and liked to think that some day a wonderful

man would come along and take me away from my unhappy home. I thought that he would be tall and dark. I never had many love affairs. My mother didn't want me to marry for love. She wanted to fix me up with someone. It had to be a rich man. She picked out a man for me and tried to make me marry him. I ran away from home for two weeks and stayed at my uncle's house."

A closely related situation is that in which the unwanted child is actually the child of only one of the parents. This situation may be illustrated in the case of Mr. A. whose mother had died, his father soon remarrying. Four children were born to the second marriage, whereas Mr. A. was the only child by the first marriage. As a child Mr. A. always felt neglected and abused because his father never paid attention to him. In describing this phase of his life, he said:

"My stepmother made me scrub, wash dishes, and run errands for her. The other children never did anything. She was a stepmother and I knew that I was a stepchild. My father took the cue from her. I can recall my father having bought only one suit for me at which time he argued for a reduction in price, saying to the clerk, 'Can't you make it cheaper—he is an *orphan*?' I never got over that remark."

In many situations—and this is particularly true of domestic discord—the child may find he has no unified family role; that is to say, the attitude of one parent is contradictory to that of the other parent. In extreme cases, there may be an intense dislike for a daughter on the part of a mother, while the same child is the father's favorite. Should the case be one of domestic discord, the difference in attitudes on the part of the two parents may become even more highly exaggerated, the one parent reacting toward the child in terms of certain traits identified with the other parent.

While differing in minor details the same ambiguity characterizes all the situations which have been presented. First, the unwanted child's position is an ambiguous one because of recurring ideas of adoption. The child with the orphan role also has an ambiguous position due to the fluctuating attitudes of the real parent. Furthermore, in situations where each

parent displays a different attitude toward the child his role lacks consistency.

How this ambiguity in the role of the child results in phantasy is clearly brought out in the H. case. Here the phantasy role develops in response to the attitudes of the father toward the child, which are in conflict with those of her mother:

"As far back as I can remember I always liked pretty things. I was very fond of my father and he liked me; that is, he was proud of me. I was the oldest and rather intelligent for my age and always kept myself clean and nice. He always stood by me. When I couldn't get pretty things any other way, my father was the one who sneaked them to me. I never could get along with my mother. She never understood me. I never felt that I could confide in her. She always opposed everything I ever did or ever thought about. When I wanted something so bad, I refused to eat a meal. My father always noticed this and managed somehow to get the thing and slip it to me.

"I remember so well how I always loved beautiful things; for example, I remember when I was just a young girl I had some embroidered underwear. At that time most girls were wearing plain underwear. I had just one suit but washed it out every few nights. My mother would say to me, 'Respectable girls don't wear embroidered underwear. Respectable girls don't take a bath every night and spend so much time taking care of their body.' This was what my mother always told me.

"I remember very well when they were wearing a certain kind of a ribbon hair dress. I thought I would give almost anything if I had such a beautiful head dress. I didn't eat a meal or two and my father slipped me some money to buy one. Then one day I wore it. My mother immediately started calling me names and telling me that it wasn't respectable to wear such things. She pulled it off of me and tore it to pieces. I screamed and became hysterical. I was taken to the Juvenile Detention Home. I was fourteen years at that time but I was told that that was a delinquent department and that I did not belong there. Before I was sent home, however, I was examined by the judge, who gave me a mental test. He told me that I passed one hundred per cent plus. He said to my mother, 'Your daughter is a genius. All she needs is the right environment.' Then he said that he wasn't going to send me home but sent me to the B- Club. Everyone at the B- Club liked me. Miss A., who was head

of it, said that she would like to adopt me. I was always so lively. Then I had a scrap with Miss R. and went home.

"As a girl I never liked to work. I didn't like store work or factory work. I didn't like the surroundings and I never wanted to associate with the girls there. In fact, as a girl I had very few girl friends. I always wanted to associate with someone better and older than the ones I met while working. Then I started boarding out because I could not get along with my mother. Boarding doesn't furnish much of a home life. I met the boys and girls on the corner. I had lots of boy friends but the girls didn't like me. I just didn't seem to impress them.

"I was sent to the Detention Home two or three times. One time I called the superintendent a liar and was sent to the House of Refuge until I apologized. I was examined there and found to be virtuous but it was there that I became wise. I heard so much. The place was full of delinquent girls. I left there on February 24th and got into trouble the first of April. I was confined in the Y— Home. Just previous to this my father committed suicide by drinking poison. That was a blow to me. I really loved my father. He seemed to be the only person who understood me. I never was able to confide in my mother. I remember it was my father who had to explain to me about my menses. My mother never even did that. My father had been so proud of me. I told him that I was pregnant. Others have told me that they think he committed suicide because of my trouble, but I don't think that was true because he didn't blame me and must have felt proud when he learned that he was going to be a grandfather, as he loved children.

"After my confinement in the Y— Home, my mother told me she would take me home if I gave the baby away. I refused as I really liked my baby. I was given a home with a woman who heard of my predicament through the papers. I thought I was really going to have a home but found out that all she wanted was a maid. I was working so hard and one day collapsed. I was found by the telephone man and sent to the hospital. After that I was sent to the country. Mrs. R., a wealthy lady, took a great interest in me. I was really perfectly happy. I had my baby, my board was being paid, and I had a dollar a week spending money. My mother did not let me come to see her but my sisters came to see me and were fond of the baby. At that time an elderly man wanted to marry me. Then I met Mrs. D. She sent me a package of beautiful clothes. I was so touched by the whole thing because up to this time everyone had condemned me and

made me feel like I had committed a great crime. I felt that I could hold my head up. Mrs. D. was the first one who helped me to hold my head up and made me feel that I was a human being.

"Soon after this I saw my future husband, whom I had known for a couple of years. He said, 'I suppose you are married?' I said, 'Yes, but I am not living with my husband.' He immediately asked to see me. That Sunday he came but I told him that I could not go out because I had no one to leave the baby with. He said, 'Why, we're going to take the baby along.' I felt so happy because I thought, 'Here is a man who is not ashamed to take the baby along.' He understood my situation. A few weeks later he asked me to marry him and I consented. I really never loved him. I guess the only reason I married him was because he was so kind to me."¹

Problems in personality adjustment do not necessarily arise whenever there is phantasy. So long as the individual recognizes that the imaginatively reconstructed role is only a pleasant refuge from a less desirable one, which is nevertheless his own, no complications appear. If, however, he loses complete orientation with the role society grants him and withdraws into the world of his imagination, he still solves his problem satisfactorily so far as he himself is concerned, though he becomes a problem to society.

More often, however, the individual attempts to realize in overt behavior the reconstructed role, tending to look upon it as that which is rightly his own and to feel that any rebuffs or obstacles which he finds represent persecution. This is essentially what happened in the case of Mrs. H. She was constantly striving to make contacts in some group in which she could realize a superior role. She was able to accomplish

¹This marriage culminated in a divorce twelve years later. The period of married life was broken by frequent separations. These were brought on by constant quarreling between Mr. and Mrs. H. about Mrs. H.'s contacts with men. In each instance the men with whom Mrs. H. had contact were of a higher social class, one being an orchestra leader, another a physician, etc. Throughout the time she was married to Mr. H. she continued to be interested in the father of her first child, who had been ordered by the court to support the child. This and her other numerous contacts resulted in constant suspicion and jealousy on the part of Mr. H., which was finally brought to a head by his suit for divorce on the grounds of adultery. The custody of the children, including the stepson, was given to Mr. H. The story of how Mrs. H. had been trapped in an apartment with another man as told by Mrs. H. was dramatically featured in the press. Mr. H., a salesman of electrical appliances, was portrayed in his wife's story as a wealthy electrical engineer whom she would always love.

this to a certain extent in groups where contacts were casual and where through the exploitation of sex she could get the attention of men of a higher social or economic class. This exploitation of the personal trait of greatest appeal—sex, facility of speech, wit, etc.,—as a means of attaining admission to a “superior” social world is, in fact, characteristic of this type of case.

In marriage relations, this drive toward realizing a superior role through the assistance of phantasy in reconstructing the social environment tends to lead to domestic discord. This is due to the fact that it either leaves out of account the marriage partner or else he becomes identified with the inferior role into which circumstances force the individual from time to time.

Marriage relations are further complicated by the fact that these are often entered into in terms of the role from which the individual wishes to escape. In this attempt to escape, conduct inevitably follows which is contrary to the moral code of the marriage partner and thus gives rise to cultural conflict.

Sex conflict, also, inevitably develops since the reconstructed role brings with it contacts with members of the other sex and leads either to actual infidelity or to the suspicion of such on the part of the other person.

Economic conflict, likewise, tends to result from this divergence in social worlds in which the two persons move, since the attempt to achieve a superior role entails obligations which the individual is not always able to meet.

How the individual's attempt to realize a superior role through the aid of phantasy results in domestic discord is brought out in the case of Mr. P.:

Mr. P. came to the United States with his parents from Europe when he was about seven years old. His family always lived on the West and Northwest Sides in Chicago.

Mrs. P. was born in Chicago. When she was three years old, she moved with her family to a small town near Chicago where she remained until she was fifteen years old. At that time her father died and the family returned to Chicago. Until her marriage, she lived on the South Side.

FAMILY ORGANIZATION

Mr. P. was next to the oldest of a family of five children—three boys and two girls. One brother is living in Chicago; another is in the U. S. Army; one sister is living in the West. Mr. P. claims not to know the whereabouts of his mother and two sisters, with whom he had difficulty about seven months ago in regard to the purchase of a monument for the father, who died about two years ago.

According to Mr. P., his father and mother showed very little attachment for each other. The father was an invalid for about eight years and the mother cared for him, but complained a great deal. Mr. P. says, "We were never a family that stuck together. We went our own way. We were rough."

As a child, Mr. P. was attached to his mother, but had no interest in his brothers or sisters. He says, "I used to scrub the floors for my mother, but no one else ever did anything. I did the dirty work. I did it willingly because I wanted my mother to like me. The other children got more attention than I did. They used to hide the good things from me."

Mr. P. feels that when he married, he lost his family. Shortly after marriage he had some difficulty with his family. He says, "Since my marriage, my only contact with the entire family was a family crisis—that is, a marriage, death, or birth of a child." He has become more and more isolated from them, and now expresses a definite inferiority and bitterness, saying, "I am the black sheep of my family. They think I am and I guess I am."

Mrs. P. was next to the oldest of a family of seven children—three girls and four boys. One brother has died. When she was fifteen years old, her father died, leaving a small insurance benefit and a small grocery store. The family moved to Chicago, where the mother conducted a grocery on the South Side for nine years.

Mrs. P. says that her mother and father were fond of each other and always got along very well. There was never any quarreling in the home. The children always got along well together. Mrs. P. says that her sisters have all married better than she has. She is in close contact with her family. The mother is now supported by a son "who has a good position and who attends a school of commerce in the evening."

CULTURAL PATTERNS

Mr. P. attended grammar school and left when he was fifteen years old, going to work. Since his marriage, he has taken a correspondence course in advertising.

Mr. P.'s father was a tailor and was never able "to get ahead."

Mr. P. says that he made friends easily and was well liked, but preferred to keep to himself and go his own way unless he was able to make friends with boys outside of his class. He was fond of shows and dances and liked to have a good time.

Mrs. P. was graduated from grammar school and attended high school at night after moving to Chicago. She went to work at the age of sixteen. She has been a saleslady and has done office work. She worked at the Review Company for \$8.00 a week when she was eighteen years old.

Mrs. P.'s father conducted a small grocery store. He made a "comfortable living," but before his death a considerable amount of money was spent on doctor bills.

Mrs. P. says that she was a lively girl and had a number of girl friends. She always attended shows and parties with her two younger sisters. Her friends were girls from the West Side. She had little contact with girls and boys in her own neighborhood. She belonged to a girls' club.

SOCIAL INTERACTION

A. Factors in Adjustment and Conflict between Family and Community

1. *Economic.* Mr. P. worked in the spooling department of a sales register company intermittently for four or five years.

Mr. P. worked for a printing house for four years and averaged about \$25.00 to \$35.00 a week. This firm, he says, went out of business.

The next job which Mr. P. held was with another printing company, where he worked for four years, earning \$40.00 to \$45.00 a week. He left to go to a specialty company, where he

worked for three years. His work here was in the department making fancy boxes. His salary averaged from \$45.00 to \$55.00 per week.

The jobs which Mr. P. has held with printing concerns have been as pressman. This work consists in feeding an automatic machine.

Mr. P.'s ideas of what he can do in the printing trade and what he would like to do seem always to have made for dissatisfaction and conflict. For instance, he says, "I was a pressman, but I *can* set type. Being a pressman is purely an automatic job. I am fit for something better."

Mr. P. has never belonged to the Printers' Union and has always worked in "open shops."

Since leaving his last job Mr. P. has worked at various "selling jobs" outside of the printing trade. During this period he has been unemployed for a longer time than he has been employed.

Mrs. P. has worked intermittently since her marriage "to help pay off debts." She has worked at a mail order house earning \$15.00 a week, and at a department store at the same wage.

2. *Health.* Neither Mr. nor Mrs. P. complains of any illness. They are having no contacts with physicians.
3. *Sex.* Mr. P. had sex relations with prostitutes prior to marriage. Mrs. P. accuses her husband of contacts with other women.
4. *Cultural.* During the first five years of their married life, the couple occasionally went to a movie or the home of a friend. Since then they have not gone out together.

Mrs. P. says that her husband has belonged to a club of men who met at the home of the various members and played cards. The wives were invited, but Mr. P. would never take her. She says that her husband is "crazy about dancing and goes to Riverside Amusement Park."

Mrs. P.'s contacts for the most part are only with relatives.

Mr. P. at one time belonged to four local lodges. About three years ago he became a Mason. At this time he solicited applications for membership and was paid sums of money by the applicants. This money he failed to give to the lodge. When this was discovered, he was tried before a "lodge jury" and "blackballed" from the lodge. Immediately after this he left home for six weeks.

5. *Pattern of Life.* Mr. P. is inclined to be egotistical. He enjoys associations, but chiefly as a means of getting what he wants. His contacts are superficial and secondary. His clothes, careful grooming, and facile manner give him "front." His experiences seem not to have fitted him for anything more than a "get-by" philosophy of adjustment. He has constantly looked beyond his horizon. There seems always to have been conflict between the role he would like to play and that which he must actually play.

Though economically more independent, emotionally Mrs. P. depends upon her husband. She seems quite adaptable. She is frank and straightforward. She definitely feels a loss of status because of her husband's behavior.

B. *Factors in Adjustment and Conflict within Family Group*

1. *Economic.* Mrs. P. complains that there have always been debts even when her husband was making as much as \$45.00 a week. She has never seen his pay checks except one when he was working for the specialty company. The family have continually been in financial difficulty. Mrs. P. has worked intermittently with the hope of paying off some of the debts.

Mr. P. has always lived above his income, buying furniture, clothes, and automobiles on the installment plan. In addition Mrs. P. accuses her husband of buying candy, flowers, and articles of wearing apparel for other women.

Mrs. P. accuses her husband of buying presents for other women instead of buying a monument for the oldest child, who died at the age of seven.

2. *Health.* Mrs. P. thinks that her husband at one time had a venereal disease.

Mrs. P. has had two abortions performed.

3. *Sex.* The first five years of married life, during which time conflict was minimized, the couple had sexual relations on the average of three times a week. Since that time relations have occurred about once in two weeks.

Mr. P. has always practiced *coitus interruptus*.

Mrs. P. says that she has never refused to have relations with her husband, and at first enjoyed the experience. During the past two years she complains that her husband has been cold toward her. She believes, therefore, that he must be interested in other women.

Mr. P. interprets his dissatisfaction with the sexual relationship as due to the fact that his wife is a frigid type.

Both Mr. and Mrs. P. have read books of a sensational nature on sex life.

4. *Cultural.* Mr. P. feels superior to his wife, saying, "I know I am smarter than my wife. I have education and ability."

Mrs. P. feels that her husband's family is inferior to her own and says she was always taught not to live by the "installment plan." Mr. P. says that his wife's family are "dumb" and "they don't know how to get by."

RATIONALIZATIONS

Mr. P. tells the following:

"I met my wife through a friend. I first got acquainted with her sister and came to the house to take her sister out. I liked her better. I knew her for six or eight months. We went out together. She was attracted to me. She was living at home and seemed fairly well satisfied, but she was young and I guess she wanted a home of her own. We got married. She wanted to live with her mother. She was attached to her family. Her father had been dead for years. The children all lived together. I couldn't stand living with her family. We lived together and paid half the expenses.

"When I got married, I lost my family. My parents objected to her. At that time I thought that they were unfair and prejudiced. They said they didn't like her because she was redheaded. Right away we started having trouble with in-laws. My mother talked against her and she talked against my mother. I tried to be neutral. But my family were prejudiced from the start, and then when we separated, it gave them grounds. It confirmed their ideas that I got the wrong deal. When my wife wanted to live with her family again and tried to get me to go back, my family told me not to move. Of course, her folks never made me feel like a boarder. I should say not! No one can make me feel inferior.

"When we lived alone, my wife complained. She thought if we went with her folks, it would make it easier for them. I felt that I was the ~~guy~~ at all the time—that I was kept there for a convenience. My wife when I met her was helping support her family. The children took care of the mother. The mother was dependent on their income. They were closely attached to each other.

"When we were first married we went out together. In all my married life I have been happy about two years. In my younger days I had worked steady, but hadn't had much money. Then I got a little money saved up. We went to live by ourselves. I was working steadily for a while. That was six years ago. I bought a car on installments and we took a trip east. That is the only time I had been happy since I was married.

"I might as well be frank. You want me to be frank. I don't get any enjoyment out of staying with her. It is just make believe when we have intercourse. She is just that type.

"She never wanted to go my way. She always wanted to go with her parents. We were twice separated the first year we were married. Maybe it couldn't be called a separation, but she was living with her folks and I wanted to move. So I would go away for a few days and then she would move out and join me.

"The truth of the matter is that I have never been satisfied. I have always been restless. I have always felt that my jobs never fit my ability. I always feel that I can do more than I am given a chance to do. It is a temptation for me to go higher. I have the education, the ability, but I never got the opportunity. I am not a fool. I have been around. I can do anything in the printing line. I like people and I like salesmanship. Everyone who has seen me sell anything or

even talk to them says that I would make a wonderful salesman. I have taken courses in advertising. I can talk myself into any place. I have always been anxious to get ahead and make a good impression on people. I always want to be a bigger man than I am. I haven't had much experience at selling, but I can do it if I had the job. There is nothing I couldn't do if I got the chance.

"I am not on speaking terms with my wife's family or my own family. I blame all my family difficulty and financial state on them. I lost my last job on account of my family trouble.

"As far as affection is concerned, I might as well be frank. I don't care for my wife. We are man and wife, but I have no love for her. I like the children, but we don't fit. But we are making the best of it now. There is nothing else to do.

"My wife isn't confident—that's the trouble with her. She thinks that I am too confident. She thinks people are crooked. I take people in a modern way. I don't believe in being too truthful. I believe in telling enough lies to get by. Yet, of course, I wouldn't want to spoil my moral character. My wife is too honest. I feel superior to the next person. I wouldn't hesitate at anything. I know that I am smarter than my wife. She always wants to tell the truth. If I had told the truth to the people, I wouldn't have gotten by this far. That's the modern way of doing things.

"Now I seem to be down and out. My family think I am the black sheep. I guess every family has a black sheep. I have no one to go to. We are in a mess of a situation. As far as my wife is concerned, she knows that I don't care for her. She has tried to help me out, but she doesn't satisfy me. I want to get higher."

Mrs. P. tells the following:

"I was married when I was twenty-one. I knew my husband six months. He was learning the printing trade at that time. My girl friend had gone with him. She worked at the same place. He had nice ways and was neat in appearance. He was about twenty. We got engaged three months after we met. My husband made the engagement party for me to meet his family. It wasn't a success. His uncle said that he didn't want him to marry a redhead. He didn't want a redhead in his family. His family were more European than mine. I was too Americanized for them. I was very quiet. They thought I was different from them.

"Just before we got married, a cousin of mine heard that Mr. P. had ruined a girl. My mother wanted to stop the wedding, but I begged her not to because I belonged to a club of girls. I was ashamed to break off the engagement for fear of what they would say. My mother didn't like his mother. She thought his family acted strange. His mother thought that he should marry a girl with money. My family decided to make the best of it.

"When we got married my mother advised us to save our money for a while. She thought it would be cheaper if we came and lived with her. She always believed in buying for cash and not on the installment plan. We lived with my mother for two months and then left. He made me take a room with him over at his mother's. I stood it for a little while. One thing happened that I never can forget. When I got married, I had three yards of white ribbon on my flowers. One day I missed the ribbon. The next day I saw it on his sister's hair. I felt very bad about it because I thought if I had a little girl, I would want her to have that ribbon. I told my husband about it and he told me to keep quiet. I told him that I didn't want to live there. Then we went back to my mother. We stayed there until the first baby was eight months old. We paid board and room. My mother wanted us to save our money. She never said anything against him. Then he decided that we should take furniture on payment and have our own home. We took a flat in the same building with his mother. We bought an ice box, which we kept in the hall. Both of us were to use it. Then I began to miss milk and butter. I insisted that we move the ice box into the house. That caused more trouble.

"When we were first married, my husband was only making \$12.00 a week, but I thought he was learning a trade. We got along all right then.

"Ten years ago I first started hearing things about my husband. A neighbor told me that he saw my husband at a show with a woman. I heard things, but I kept quiet. I covered up everything until three years ago. Then I decided there wasn't any use any longer.

"Seven years ago I lost my oldest child. She was seven years old when she died. After my girl died, I couldn't stand to live in the flat. That lasted for a year. I wanted to keep the other children close to me all the time because I was afraid of everything. The girl died in four days. It was so sudden, I couldn't realize it. My husband has never given me money to fix up the grave, or buy a monument. It is so

covered with leaves, you can hardly find it. But he buys presents for other women instead. I was so upset after she died that the doctor advised me to go to a summer resort without the children. I couldn't stand it there. I stayed for three days and came home.

"The first five years things weren't so bad. His mother was always against me. One day she came to the house. I happened to be sick and my husband was washing out the diapers. She made a scene and said to him, 'You should do such work!' She used to keep him at her house. She didn't seem to care for him when I first married him, but as soon as we had trouble, she tried to keep him from me.

"When the war broke out, my mother said to me, 'Let him go to war.' I went to the draft board and arranged for him to be drafted. Then when I got to thinking it over, I got worried and went back and begged the draft board not to take him. I thought then I would give him another chance. I always wanted to give him chances. I was ashamed. All my girl friends had married well. I tried to keep up appearances. Eight years ago my mother told me to leave him. She said that she would take care of the children.

"My husband used to stay out till two or three o'clock in the morning. He said that he worked or was at a meeting. I didn't quarrel with him about it because I took it for granted that it was an excuse, but I kept quiet.

"He has always been a good talker, but he has gotten into plenty of difficulty. He was put out of the lodges. He has gambled and he used to go with girls. People saw him in shows downtown. Whenever he got into difficulty over money—that is, difficulty with the lodge and forging checks—he left me.

"For a while I lived with my mother-in-law. She was working. She used to leave me to take care of the old man. He was a good man. I felt sorry for him. Then I went to work to help pay the debts. Whenever I bought anything my mother-in-law would say, 'Why do you have to buy that?'

"We have never had bad quarrels. We argue. I know what to believe and what not to believe.

"Three years ago he bought a car. Then he started taking girls out. The children would ask him for a ride, but he would never take them. Three years ago he was fired from his place of work. He left me at the same time.

"I don't refuse to stay with him, but I don't get any satisfaction. I have had two abortions. He has made me do it. When I had the last abortion, I made out a paper that if anything happened to me that my husband was to blame. I signed it and gave it to my mother to keep. That was two years ago in November. He thinks I don't know why he doesn't care to stay with me. I know what is going on, but I never let on.

"He wants to get in an office. He doesn't want to work at the printing trade. He isn't smart enough to do office work.

"In the last two years we have only paid rent for two months. I don't know how he does it. He can talk people into anything. We lived at one place where the rent was \$60.00. He rented the place and got a two months' concession. I don't know how he got it without paying anything. He got the two months and then stayed on three months more. So we lived there five months without paying a cent's rent. We lived at another address for a month and a half without paying any rent. During the last two years he has had three cars, two Fords and one Chevrolet. He had a new one last April, but had to let it go in July. I don't know how he buys the cars.

"I owed a bill at the grocery in the neighborhood. A friend of mine who feels sorry for me, stood good for the bill. My husband took a check and paid the bill and got \$15.00 in cash. It was a forged check. Then the grocer held my friend responsible, so she said that for my sake she would settle with the grocer. That is the way he does. Three years ago he forged three checks—one at \$10.00 and two at \$15.00. He always cashes these checks at the grocers. Then they take pity on me and don't arrest him. I feel so ashamed. I think everyone must look at me. I feel that everyone I meet on the street knows about it. Of course, they don't blame me. He knows how to work people.

"He got out of paying his garage rent the same way that he did the house rent. But one day the garage man knew how to handle him. He saw the car standing in front of the house and hauled it in. Then I had to give my husband my wedding ring and engagement ring, which he pawned for \$27.00 before he could get the car.

"He is happy-go-lucky. Things don't worry him. All he wants is to be a bigger man than he is. He sleeps all day Sunday. This morning he came in at a quarter of two.

"He is the kind of person if he can work people, he doesn't care. That's all right. But if someone gives him something, he doesn't like it. He hasn't any scruples about working people.

"During the last three years he was at home about six months.

"The children, that is the two older ones, know what is going on. They say, 'We don't understand why father is so mean.' They like him, but they don't show any affection for him. I am afraid my children may not be much good if I don't watch them as they might take after him. I have to watch Ralph. He goes with a bad group of boys. One boy took a dollar from his mother last week and was treating Ralph all week. He goes with boys younger than him. He seems to be afraid of older boys. To me he seems more like a girl. He is a quiet child. He used to go with girls. Until he was in the fourth grade, he went every place with his sister until she complained that she wouldn't go with him any longer.

"To me my husband is a puzzle. I just don't understand him. At times he will be so nice, and the next ten minutes he will be different. He likes to pose as a single man. A man from a candy store in the neighborhood came to me several times. Finally I asked him what he wanted. He told me that my husband owes the store a bill for \$15.00 for candy which he bought for a girl. The man at first thought he was single and thought he was rooming at my house.

"My husband has three suits, which he took on the installment plan. He always gets clothes some way. He is selfish and doesn't care if the rest of us have anything. He likes himself. He doesn't think anyone is bigger than he is. Sometimes he will stand before a looking glass and say, 'How pretty I look.' My girl will say, 'You haven't Ma beat.' I don't love him. I only stick with him on account of the children, and then maybe it is foolish, but I think maybe he will wake up some time."

Mr. P. as the neglected child in a family of five children endeavors to attract the attention and affection of his mother by performing menial tasks. He shows little interest in his brothers and sisters, who receive most of the attention.

Mr. P. early prefers to keep to himself unless he is able to make friends with boys outside his social class. It is doubtful if, at this time, he had many friends.

At fifteen Mr. P. leaves school and goes to work. For a period of about fifteen years he works in the printing trade doing semi-skilled jobs but always insisting that he is "fit for something better." Believing that he is not utilizing his best abilities he turns to selling, which to him implies superior status. His rationalizations in regard to his inability to secure better jobs are typical of this personality type, since his stock explanation is that he has never had an opportunity. He feels that for fifteen years he has been forced to work as a pressman when he has had the ability to set type.

Through his facile verbalization and well-groomed appearance, Mr. P. assumes the rôle of a clubman joining five lodges, including the Masonic Order, in which he serves on the membership committee. Thus through these secondary contacts he is able to realize a superior role.

Mr. P. further escapes from the earlier role by frequenting dance halls and cabarets as a single man. He is, in all, quite the man about town until he is unable to meet his financial obligations undertaken in pursuance of the superior role.

Domestic discord inevitably develops because of the identification of the wife with Mr. P.'s earlier role. While Mr. P. is constantly trying to realize a superior role, he makes contacts with groups to whom his wife is unknown. This leads to conduct of which she disapproves, since Mr. P. is not in her eyes the individual he aspires to be. While his contacts in a different social world from her own give him a certain glamour, on the whole she reacts to him in terms of the role from which he is trying to escape.

Furthermore, in keeping up his "front," Mr. P. resorts to forgery, fails to pay his rent, runs up bills, all of which embarrass his wife and lead to conflict. Mr. P. justifies his conduct by adopting a philosophy of life which is wholly repugnant to Mrs. P. Even in sex contacts there are indications that his conduct was at variance with the standards not only of his wife but also of his primary group.

It is apparent, then, that throughout his life Mr. P. has attempted to escape through phantasy a role which is repugnant

to him. In this drive he has not been successful on the whole, for it has led him into difficulties with his family, his friends, and his acquaintances. The discord with his wife is simply a part of the larger conflict pattern, since she is identified with the role from which he wishes to escape.

Phantasy, however, is not essentially different from the related escape mechanisms, illness and drink. Since this is true one might expect to find considerable similarity in the forms of domestic discord under all three sets of conditions. This is, in fact, true to the extent that exaggerated sex conflict is found in all. The question arises, however, as to the degree to which this seeming similarity is fundamental, and if so does it differ from sex conflict in other types of cases?

•

PART THREE

DOMESTIC-DISCORD PATTERNS

•

CHAPTER IX

DOMESTIC-DISCORD PATTERNS: SEX CONFLICT

The form which domestic discord takes is not always determined by premarital forces as was found in the cases previously discussed.¹ In a second group of cases domestic discord develops out of situations arising within the marriage relationship itself. While personality disorganization may be present in both groups of cases, it exists in the first group prior to marriage, and therefore determines, as has been seen, the particular domestic-discord patterning. In the second group, where personality disorganization is present, it grows out of the domestic-discord situation, rather than precedes it. This is not to say, however, that personality disorganization is always present where there is domestic discord.

In the second group of cases, accordingly, the individual from the standpoint of personality seems to be adjusted; that is, he has developed a pattern of life which does not hinder his adaptation to new situations. Whatever conflicts arise in marriage, therefore, develop out of the complex of factors comprising the marriage situation. These cases tend to fall, for the most part, into two major divisions: Cultural Conflict and Response Conflict, of which the latter is perhaps the larger group. One would probably anticipate this in view of the place *response* holds in modern marriage, having usurped the role of most of the functions of the earlier family.

The desire for response,² that is, for sympathy, appreciation, and understanding, involves the most subtle aspects of the mar-

¹See Chapters IV-VIII.

²"The desire for response," Thomas says, "is primarily related to the instinct of love, and shows itself in the tendency to seek and to give signs of appreciation in connection with other individuals."—*The Unadjusted Girl*, p. 17.

riage relationship. It is that desire for the satisfactions which grow out of a mutual integration of individual behavior such that the reactions of one person are supplemented and enhanced by those of the other.

The desire for response is universal among human beings. In the marriage relation it involves the demonstration of affection, the sharing of interests, aspirations and ideals, by husband and wife.

Response involves a highly sensitive mutual reactivity of each individual to the other, that is to say, a sensing of the other person's reaction and sympathizing with it. A case in point is that of a husband, unemployed for several months, who looks for work each day. Upon arrival home, in the evening, his wife although worried and discouraged, makes no reference to the events of the day. "I never ask him if he has found work, for I know how he must feel, and anyway I know he would tell me if he had been successful."

Response relations between husband and wife are furthermore characterized by exclusiveness, by which a world belonging to the couple alone is created. This is the realm of nicknames, pet phrases, etc., which indicate the degrees of response. It is also the realm of sex contacts which symbolize the exclusive character of marriage relations and give expression to the basic impulses of sex.

Since response involves the most subtle aspects of marriage relations, one would expect conflicts in the response realm to be highly complex and interwoven. This is often true to such an extent that each element in the response relationship is so intimately tied up with every other phase of married life that to set off a part means to set off the whole. This grows out of the fact that in marriage relations there develops an exclusive system of language and symbols which not only serve as a mechanism of communication but telescope the whole of marriage relations.

While conflict in response involves the whole realm of response relations, in its more restricted sense it is often thought of in terms of sexual conflict or sexual incompatibility. The

fact that the sex factor is so often present in domestic-discord cases has led many students of the subject to speak of sex as the underlying cause of conflict in marriage relations. While it is true that sex conflict is usually found in domestic-discord cases, sometimes even appearing in disguised form, the conflict is in most instances so complex as to involve every phase of the marriage relationship. *Sex cannot, therefore, be considered the basic factor any more than any other of the factors which make up the conflict pattern.*

There is, however, a sense in which one is justified in differentiating between sex and response conflict. While in the broader sense response includes sex, the more highly developed aspects of response involve such a high degree of sublimation that the basic sex impulse may be largely lost. Furthermore, it is possible for dissociation between sex and response desires to be so complete as to cover up the connection between them. This may be seen in cases where the wife sanctions extra-marital sex relations so long as they are with professional prostitutes, since these do not threaten response contacts. In some cases, on the other hand, the whole response relationship seems to be telescoped into sex contacts. Sublimation plays little or no part in the relations between husband and wife under these circumstances and, accordingly, conflict under these conditions may be called sex conflict. Thus the response-conflict pattern seems to cover a wide range from those cases in which conflict centers around relations which are almost completely dissociated from sex to those in which sex seems to constitute an element of major, if not exclusive, importance. In describing the large group of cases which fall within these two extremes, it is necessary to begin at one end in which conflict centers almost exclusively around sex and proceed systematically to the other extreme, where sex disappears except as a basis for sublimation and symbolization.

Sex conflict seems to grow out of a variety of situations, the first being the differentiation of the sex impulse of husband and wife. Whatever innate differences exist between the male and female are generally conceded to be differences in peri-

odicity rather than of innate strength of the sex impulse. Differences, therefore, aside from this physiological one, may be said to be cultural in nature, growing out of the experience of the group, and of the individual. In theory, according to the traditional puritanical code, sex relations were not to be engaged in except for purposes of propagation. In practice, however, this was much more binding upon the wife than upon the husband, since a certain amount of sexual irregularity and sexual satisfaction was tolerated in the husband. Discussion of sex was taboo; but, again, in practice this applied only to women, men engaging in conversations regarding their sexual exploits.

Sexual antagonism on the part of the wife is not uncommon and often follows sex shock experienced early in the marriage relationship. It is not unusual in many groups to find women with no very definite knowledge of sex at the time of marriage. This is likely to mean that the occasion of first intercourse is met with horror and resentment. In the larger number of the group of cases studied, the man made few or no preliminary advances which might have prepared his wife for the sex act, having himself had no adequate sexual education. It is true, of course, that a number of men in this group have had sexual contacts with prostitutes. In this respect, therefore, they are on much more familiar ground than are their wives. This previous experience, however, undoubtedly tends to make them less considerate of their wives, since in these illegitimate contacts there has been no need for preliminaries. In fact, the opposite situation from that experienced in marriage is likely to prevail. In the case of irregular relations it is the woman who is expected to facilitate sexual intercourse, and her professional success depends upon her ability to do so. Sexual satisfaction tends to be completely dissociated from caresses, affection, and the like, the only obligation assumed by the man being a monetary one.

The natural rebellion against the pain and the traditional attitude of duty is clearly evidenced in the following excerpt, which presents quite a typical situation:

"We had intercourse the first night. I knew nothing about what it meant to stay with a man. I became nauseated. Whenever he touched me it made me sick. He seemed like a brute. It frightened me. I felt like my life was changed. Nothing seemed right. I felt rebellious. After the first night I felt different inside and outside. From that first night I hated my husband and I have been hating him for nine years. The next day I went to my mother. She told me, 'That is marriage; men are like that—women must make the best of it.' The first three years I made the best of it; then I stopped the family life. For six years we have been living like boarders."

Lack of sexual satisfaction on the part of the wife inevitably seems to lead to sex conflict. That this lack of satisfaction in intimate relations is often due to ignorance of the physiology or psychology of the sex act is apparent. Many husbands and wives know little or nothing of sex hygiene. Furthermore, many women married for years not only have never experienced an orgasm, but do not know that they should experience one. They describe in detail their feelings at the time intercourse takes place; their dissatisfactions and bitterness, but they have no appreciation of what may be the cause. In so far as a woman becomes aroused, as she is bound to do in spite of puritanical ideas, she will rebel against this dissatisfaction. Part of the rebellion is a physiological tension which she cannot explain and which makes her irritable. This irritation becomes directed against her husband.

In addition there is the traditional attitude that a woman is not expected to experience satisfaction in the act. Her role is to submit to man. Thus her attitude toward her husband is one of submissiveness: "Men are like that; it is woman's duty." This attitude, however, is contradictory to the modern feminist attitude that woman is free and should not be governed by autocratic rule. The physiological tension, therefore, often becomes rationalized into a rebellion against what seems to the wife to be an infringement upon her rights and freedom.

This feeling that her rights are not being given due consideration enables the wife in many cases to justify her use of sex relations as a control technique and to pretend to her hus-

band that she does not care for these relations. This is illustrated in the following excerpt:

"We had trouble from the first about living together. I felt hurt and abused. I felt hurt at the way he left me at home. That made me not want to stay with him. When I didn't stay with him, he went and complained to his mother. That made me still more sore, that he even told her that. When my husband got the rheumatism his mother said that this was caused by not having a wife often enough. I felt resentful and decided, 'If I'm not good enough in the daytime, I'm not good enough at night.'

"When I stayed with him I didn't feel satisfied. He only cared for himself. I stayed with him as much as I could and felt it was my duty because I didn't want him to go to other women. When I didn't stay with him, he said that I must be staying with some other man.

"He has always gone out by himself. Last year we started going out together. He used to go alone and I told him that I had decided to go, too. He didn't like that. He wanted me to be a slave to my home. I have decided that I want to be free—I want to lead my own life.

"Do you think it is easy? I feel healthy. He is a young man and healthy. But I make him think I don't like it. I want to show him that I can be independent. I have even made him sleep on the floor. It is not enough for me, but I don't let him know it. Do you think I would give him that much satisfaction?"

In other situations conflict centers around this same use by the wife of sex relations as a control technique except that a price is placed upon them. Thus in the group studied it is not uncommon for the wife to say to her husband, "I will stay with you if you will give me \$10.00." The husband's reply usually is, "I can buy it on the outside for less than that." When the wife places a price upon her submission, the implication frequently is that the husband has already engaged in extra-marital relations; and if he is willing to pay in those situations, then she too is justified in demanding payment. It is, no doubt, this subtle accusation implied in the wife's statement which intensifies the already latent conflict.

Fear of pregnancy is, in many instances, an important factor in lack of sexual satisfaction on the part of the wife. Sex relations become associated with childbearing. As one wife puts it, "I enjoyed it until I saw so many children coming." The husband may not want to have another child because he cannot afford to support it. The wife's fear, however, is something more. Not infrequently she has already had several pregnancies, and dreads the discomfort and pain of further childbearing. In other instances, it means further infringement upon her freedom. She must constantly stay at home and care for her children, while her husband is able to go places and continue his social contacts.

In the group under discussion abortion was quite common. However, the mental conflict and anxiety during the period preceding the performance of the abortion, to say nothing of that following, becomes something to be avoided. Then, too, abortion is not always possible, due to the fact that the pregnancy may be too advanced or the price of the operation beyond reach.¹ Self-induced abortions are oftentimes attempted but usually are unsuccessful.

Pregnancy becomes, then, something to be avoided at all costs. While birth control is often thought to be widespread, in many groups contraceptive measures are either unknown or little used. *Coitus interruptus* was almost universally used in the group studied, during the period prior to treatment. This method of preventing conception, however, proved unsatisfactory for several reasons. In some instances, inasmuch as conception had taken place during the period *coitus interruptus* had been used, the wife's fear of pregnancy was not removed. In such instances the wife rarely experienced an orgasm. The husband, also, often complained of dissatisfaction and of nervousness.

Other attempts at prevention of conception were extra-vaginal relations: *coitus per anum*, *fellatio*, mutual and individual masturbation. These were engaged in with some

¹The fee of \$25.00, which is the customary charge by physicians specializing in this illegal practice, is not always available for this purpose.

amount of satisfaction for a year or two only to become intolerable later, because thought to result in some form of physical disorder which the person experienced or imagined. The source of the disorder was, as might be expected, misinterpreted, but the experience none the less served as an effective check to extra-vaginal relations.

So far the situation has been considered chiefly from the standpoint of the dissatisfaction of the wife. The husband, however, is invariably dissatisfied as well, and shows this in having extra-marital relations or in a diminution of sex contacts with his wife which she interprets as indicating extra-marital relations.

This, in fact, constitutes a crisis in the sequence. A diminution of sexual advances on the part of the husband leads the wife invariably to suspect her husband of infidelity and to interpret all his behavior in this light. Jealousy knows no bounds in the wife who says, "My husband no longer comes near me; I know he must have another woman." If he dresses carefully preparatory to going out, she accuses him of dressing to meet another woman. She may even grow jealous of his attention to members of her own family or to his own children if they happen to be of the opposite sex. Accusations are repeated again and again, often resulting in either the husband leaving the home temporarily, or assuming a roomer role—coming home late at night and leaving early in the morning, having no contact with the family.

Refusal to have sex relations or dissatisfaction in the sexual relationship may very quickly lead to conflict in other spheres of relations and so break down all attachments. This is what happened in the Y. case. Here the sex conflict soon produces an economic conflict—the implication on the part of the husband being that a wife does not deserve support if she is not a "wife" in the true sense of the word. Cultural conflict arises when the husband feels that if he can sleep alone he can go out alone and follow his own recreational interests. Cultural conflict becomes intensified when remarks are made by the wife which reflect upon the status of the husband. Con-

flict arises with the children, which leads to irritability and nervousness and the implication by the wife that the husband is weak and sick, an inferior individual. The conflict finally culminates in the husband leaving the house and being accused of relations with other women.

"We got along very well at first," said Mrs. Y., "until about two months after we were married. Then he frightened me one night. He screamed and kicked. Since that time I haven't slept with him. . . .

"He isn't any good. We lived together [i.e., had sex relations] but he doesn't care much about it. He doesn't satisfy me. He doesn't know how to stay with a woman. My first husband was so different. I didn't care to have a baby this time, but he wanted one saying that I had children and he wanted one too. . . . He has changed so since I married him. He has become so mean, hits the children, and orders them around. He is so stingy. All I want is support from him unless he wants to come home and be good. I don't know why he left. He just packed his clothes, left me \$10.00, and left the house.

"After six weeks of married life," explained Mr. Y., "I awoke one morning and found I was alone in bed. About this time my wife came into the room. 'I certainly had a night of it,' she said. 'You acted awful-screamed.' I told her I didn't know anything about it. She said she was afraid to sleep with me so went to sleep with her fourteen-year old girl.

"I felt downhearted, I did not want to be just a roomer. I wanted to sleep with my wife. I thought, 'Here I have married, I have no family [i.e., no relatives here]; then she sleeps with her daughter and I don't have a friend at night time.' . . .

"I usually get up at six-thirty. Sometimes at six-ten my wife comes in my room. I tell her if she can't sleep with me, I don't want her in the morning.

"Then I said to myself, 'Why go to work hard when at night time I have no friend?' So five months ago I stopped giving her the pay to see if that would make her realize anything. I told her it was women like her who make men go to wild women. She told me I could go to see another woman. But I would never do that. Men get disease from such women. My wife was pregnant and I wouldn't want to hurt my baby. . . .

"We hardly ever went out together. I made up my mind that since we slept alone we could go alone. Then her boy started making me nervous. He made noises and teased the baby. My wife wouldn't stop him. Then my wife said I wasn't any good—that I was nervous and sick.

"Then my wife called me a 'Galacian pig' because I came from a different part of the country than she did. She talked all the time about her first husband. She buried a husband, she said, but she wishes it had been this one (meaning me). I replied that if she wasn't able to forget her first husband she should not have married me.

"Two weeks ago Sunday, after sitting home all day, I went out at eight o'clock for a walk. I met a friend and he took me to his home. We had tea and talked until ten. When I got home, my wife's neighbor and her two boys and girl were there. It was about eleven. Often this woman comes over and stays until eleven. I complained, but my wife always says, 'You are afraid for the electric light; that is the reason you don't sit up late.'

"They were playing cards. Three of the children were kicking and playing on the floor. I went over to my wife's boy and said, 'It is 11 P. M. Why don't you go to bed?' I got mad and hit him. I am sorry. I didn't exactly mean for the boy to go to bed. I meant for the big ones to go home.

"My wife jumped up. 'Keep your hands off. I will throw at you whatever I can find.' The neighbor woman said, 'I wouldn't live with such a man.'

"I decided to leave. I went to sleep—alone. The next day I took my things and left. . . .

"Three days later I went back home. I wanted to see the baby and thought we would talk things over. My wife called me a 'pimp.' She said she knows I have been living with another woman. . . .

"I decided there was no future this way, so I am living away from home."

While dissatisfaction of the wife may, in many situations, be due to various inhibitions which diminish her sex impulse,

in other instances it is due to her stronger sex desire. This situation is often the result of physical or psychological impotency, sterility, or lessened virility of the husband.

Fear of loss of virility appears not to be uncommon among men. This fear seems to be associated with past sexual irregularities: practice of perversions, contacts with prostitutes, and contraction of a venereal disease. Psychological impotency having as its basis fear and worry following the contraction of a venereal disease is illustrated in the case of Mr. B.:

"I stayed with a girl—a common girl. I got a disease [gonorrhea]. The doctors told me I must be careful. . . . Now for six years I haven't been able to stay with my wife.¹ I haven't told anyone about it. I have been ashamed. I am weak. I can't stay with a woman. I worry about it all the time. I dream about it at night. I still have a feeling but I am too weak. My wife is a healthy woman and I disappoint her. She laughs at me—I am so weak. It burns me up! What good am I to her? I can't blame her. What does my wife have from me? I can't sleep at night. But I haven't lost all my manhood."²

In the popular mind there is little differentiation between sterility and lack of sexual virility. Marked feelings of inferiority usually go along with these deficiencies, for such they are considered in the cultural norms of most groups. It is not unusual to find marked fear and jealousy expressed by one suffering from an inferiority of this kind. A husband, feeling that he has very little to offer his wife, may fear that she will go to someone who can offer that which he himself does not possess. This is what happened in the F. case. The husband, conscious of his own deficiency, displays such marked jealousy and fear as to be incomprehensible to his wife. His conflict may be even more marked owing to the fact that the situation has not been discussed with the wife.

¹This explanation seems to have had no basis in fact since a physical examination showed no evidence of a residual gonorrheal prostatitis.

²At times Mr. B. is boastful of his exploits with women, talking at length of his strong sex desire. At other times he tries to compensate for his inferiority by extreme outbursts of temper, which often enable him to completely dominate situations.

Mr. and Mrs. F. were married at the ages of forty-one and thirty-three respectively. For the first three years they got along very well. Then Mr. F. became extremely jealous. He became jealous of everyone who came to the house. One morning Mrs. F. was not feeling well and was reclining on the bed. The laundryman, upon calling for the laundry inquired of the husband, "What is the matter with Mrs. F.?" Mr. F. then insinuated that the laundryman had asked about his wife in "too friendly a way."

As time went on Mr. F. became more and more jealous of his wife, even getting under the bed in order to watch her. When he came home in the evening he entered the house so quietly that he frightened her. She has told him that if he cannot trust her, he can get a divorce. However, they are fond of each other.

Mr. and Mrs. F. lived together on the average of once a week. They have never practiced birth control but have never had a child. Mrs. F. has always been anxious to have a baby but her husband has never seemed interested. He has refused to go to a physician for an examination when his wife has begged him to do so.

During the past five months Mrs. F. has not menstruated. At first she was very happy, for she thought she was pregnant. Mr. F. became very angry saying, "If you are pregnant, you are not pregnant from me."

Mrs. F. was recently examined by physicians who say she is not pregnant, but is approaching an early menopause. [She is now thirty-eight.] Mr. F. does not accept the physician's statement. His wife feels that he is even jealous of the physician.

Sterility or loss of virility of the husband may have more widespread effects than the previous cases show. This is to be seen particularly in the following case, in which lessening virility of the husband leads to feelings of inferiority and general dissatisfaction with the marriage relationship.

"I liked my husband," Mrs. X. said, "but I didn't know whether I was going to marry him. My married sister said to me, 'You are twenty-one. How much longer are you going to drag around and not get married?' So I married him. We had a big wedding.

"I knew a little about marriage. I thought I shouldn't have children. It was nineteen months before I had my first child. I was

frightened when we first stayed together. The first few months I didn't want to stay with him. He finally went to my mother and talked to her. My mother scolded me and said, 'Didn't you know what married life was like? That's marriage.' He was strong then. I had a hard time with my first child. Nineteen months after my first child was born I had the second. Three years later I had the third. Six years ago I was sick and was in the hospital. My husband went to another woman then. Now he is weak and I am strong. When I first got married I didn't care for a man. Now I do. If I can't have a husband who is a husband, then I don't want one. I don't want make-believe. . . . He sleeps alone. He says I cripple him and bother him. He is so weak. I get tired of him. I have to give him money to buy his clothes. He says that I don't want to give him his meals and that I don't treat him right. He doesn't give me anything. What good is he? So far as he is concerned I might just as well not be married."

"From the beginning," said Mr. X., "I didn't like things. She wouldn't get pregnant, and I told her that if she didn't have children I wouldn't live with her. After the first child was born, she liked to stay with me. She got stronger. Before I was married I used to go to women. I got diseased but I got cured. Now my wife is hard to satisfy. She tires me out and gives me a headache. She tells me that if I can't be a husband to her, she doesn't need me. She laughs and teases me. She blames me. She says, 'What do I need you for?' Once when she was in the hospital I went to another woman. My wife knows about it. . . .

"For two years we haven't gone out together. We have been getting on each other's nerves. I get discouraged. Things get on my nerves all the time. . . . For the last two years she has been the boss in the house. I gave her the overalls to wear. I don't earn much. Since I got sick [cardiac condition], I don't get anything in the house. I never was head of the house. Now it is worse. I feel unimportant now. She tells me if I don't like it I can get out. She has become more dominating the last two years. I have trouble with the children. I can't handle them. . . . Three months ago my wife scratched my face in an argument. I slapped her back. . . . I like my wife but we can't get along. I have no say in the house. If she goes to sleep I go out and take a walk. If she stays up, I go to bed to keep away from an argument. I might as well be indifferent. She wears the overalls. The only thing I can do is to walk out. She says I don't give anything, so I am no husband."

It is interesting to observe, in the foregoing case, the wife's sexual inhibitions at the beginning of the marriage relationship. The traditional attitude toward marriage is displayed by her mother in her comment, "That is marriage." The husband early engages in extra-marital relations. When later there is evidence of his diminution in sex desire, there is implied in the attitudes of both wife and husband that this is associated with the previous sexual irregularity and venereal infection although the medical diagnosis is that of general weakness due to a severe cardiac condition. A maturing of the wife's sex impulse almost parallels the diminution of her husband's desire. Her resentment because of her dissatisfaction is evidenced. There is almost a complete reversal of the situation as found at the beginning of the marriage relationship. The wife assumes the husband's role. She becomes the aggressor in sex relations and dominates the economic situation and control of the children.

Sex conflict is further accentuated in its effect upon the relations between husband and wife in general by the fact that it often takes on a symbolic character. Thus the individual responds not only to the elements in the immediate situation but also to a whole complex of past experiences which are called to mind by the more immediate features of the conflict. These more obvious factors are, therefore, only symbolizations of conflict elements which are more fundamental and are little understood unless viewed with this fact in mind. The process of symbolization, for example, may be illustrated in the following situation:

One husband while taking a bath asked his wife to bring him a suit of underwear. Upon her appearance at the bathroom door she remarked about the large number of pimples upon his back. He immediately flew into a rage, complaining about the fact that his underwear was wrinkled. He left the home that evening, giving as his reason the neglect of his interests on the part of his wife as evidenced by the wrinkled condition of the underwear which she had brought him.

Upon the basis of the situation as described by him, his con-

duct is, of course, incomprehensible. It later developed that his wife's mention of the pimples was equivalent to her again accusing him of having had extra-marital relations, thereby contracting a venereal disease. He met the issue, not by facing it openly, but by attempting to place his wife in a disadvantageous position by making it appear that she was not performing her obligations. Yet he was quite aware that his wife not only understood his interpretation of her remark, but also appreciated the fact that he was dodging the issue.

It is apparent, of course, that the range of objects and events which take on symbolical significance is great. Not uncommonly articles of clothing, as in the H. case, become symbolic of the infidelity of the person to whom they belong or with whom they are somehow associated:

Mrs. H. complains that her husband has relations with other women. She has not had relations with him for two years owing to the fact that he is "unclean and repulsive" to her. The basis for this attitude lies back two years ago when she was sorting over soiled clothing to send to the laundry. On this occasion she found a suit of her husband's underwear stained with blood, which, she says, is proof that he had relations with another woman. When she showed the garment to her husband he denied that it belonged to him, saying it probably got mixed in with his belongings when a customer brought some articles of clothing to his shop to be cleaned. (Mr. H. is in the dry cleaning business.) This explanation, however, was unsatisfactory to Mrs. H. She has thought about it a great deal. She says that whenever she has been on the point of having intercourse with her husband, the picture of this stained garment has come before her eyes. As a result she either refused to live with him or, if she did so, the experience was repulsive and nauseating to her. She has kept the garment wrapped in a newspaper for two years.

The infidelity of the husband might have been symbolized by any other object, although clothing because of its implication of intimacy, seems to be more common than most other classes of objects. This grows out of the fact that the connection is more easily made between objects more intimately associated with the personality, and the details of infidelity imaginatively filled in by the wife. The amount of imaginative

detail filled in by the wife varies greatly. In some cases the reconstructed scene becomes so concrete and elaborate as to produce almost a physiological attitude of disgust and aversion; in others the picture is more nebulous and undefined.

Not always, however, are the symbolical factors related to situations which are actually present. In cases of second marriage, for example, the reconstructed situation to which the husband or wife reacts in response to the symbolical elements may go back to the previous marriage. The individual may be jealous of the earlier marriage relations, for example, even though they have been terminated by a death. There tends to be, of course, always a fusion of past and present, since indications of preference for past marriage relations are suggestive also of possibilities of present extra-marital relations.

Children by former marriage thus become significant in marriage relations because they tend to be identified with the previous marriage situation. Any evidence of preference for a child by previous marriage is taken by the marriage partner to mean comparative dissatisfaction with the present marriage relationship. This is shown in the G. case:

"I had known Mr. G. for several years," explained Mrs. G. "I thought he was a nice man. I left the city and was gone two and a half years. Then one day I met him again on the car. He told me that he had been married and had lost his wife. He was friendly toward me and in a few months asked me to marry him. His baby was twenty-one months old. I thought I would have a home. . . .

"I didn't want to have a child; he wanted one. It has been a miserable life and no satisfaction. We never slept together since we were married. I never get any satisfaction. I had one child—a boy. My husband sleeps with his daughter. It has been that way ever since we married. . . .

"Five years ago I went to work as a saleslady. I don't do anything in the house now. We never go out together. For the past five or six years I have been too tired to go and too disgusted. I sometimes go to a show alone or to a girl friend's.

"I liked his girl when she was a baby. She was a beautiful child. Now I don't like her so well. I have never made any difference be-

tween the children, mine and his, but he has made a difference. He will give his girl money and tell the boy to go to me. The girl is very much attached to her father. . . .

"My husband has no feeling. He has no sympathy. He doesn't care how hard I work. He cares only for his daughter. I can leave. If I leave I will take my boy and he can take his girl. He thinks more of his girl than he does of me."

"After my first wife died," said Mr. G., "I was all upset. I wanted a mother for the child. I married the second wife not because I loved her, but because I didn't know what I was doing—I was so upset. She was willing enough to marry me. It didn't take her very long to make up her mind. She liked the baby. . . . The first couple of months we were married we had trouble. In two months she got pregnant. She was all excited and didn't want to have a child. . . .

"I got along fine in my first marriage. I married a fine girl, but God had to take her away from me. If she had lived I would have been a rich and happy man. . . . During the past year she keeps her money and I keep mine. I pay the bills. She does not cook. . . . My daughter does not like her. The children seem to like each other. The boy likes his mother. He never pays any attention to me. The girl stays close to me. She has the actions of my first wife. I made up my mind not to think of my first wife after I married—that when she is dead she is dead. But my daughter reminds me of her. I like my daughter—she is all that I have. . . . My wife calls me names and calls me down before customers in my store. It makes me feel like two cents. . . .

"There is no satisfaction in staying with her. If she loved me it would be different. . . . Neither one of us get any satisfaction. She says she does not want me to touch her. She is jealous of my customers. She says I go to other women. She harps on that. . . . I feel that the whole thing is too much for me. She thinks too much of herself. Married people can't live like single people. I believe that a woman should cook the meals and take care of the house. That is the reason people get married—to have a home and to take care of it."

The symbolic significance in this case was accentuated when Mr. G. expressed his preference for his daughter by sleeping with her rather than with his wife. To the wife her husband's

sleeping with his daughter is like his sleeping with another woman, that is, his first wife. She, therefore, makes accusations that he has other women and engages in extra-marital relations.

There are situations which are quite similar, where the child is of the same sex rather than of the opposite sex. There is a difference, however, in that attitudes of infidelity are not so likely to develop in these situations. Thus a wife may feel that her husband shows preferential treatment for his son by a former marriage, but this does not lead to the feeling that he is unfaithful to her.

Or, again, where the child is of the opposite sex, the situation is sometimes further complicated by the fact that the child strongly resembles the dead parent. Thus a daughter, for example, may so remind her father of his former wife as to cause him almost completely to identify the two. His wife, noticing this, easily becomes jealous of any attention shown the daughter.

Another type of situation out of which accusations of infidelity grow is that where sex relations have occurred prior to a marriage ceremony. These attitudes of suspicion are usually displayed on the part of the husband toward the wife with whom he has had premarital relations, or whom he suspects of having had contact with other men. In many instances, the only basis of the husband's suspicion of infidelity is, "She will stay with other men because she did with me." This suspicion and jealousy is often so intense as to become an obsession, as in the M. case:

"My wife," explained Mr. M., "was four months pregnant when I married her. I married her because her mother threw out her trunk. . . . Six months after we were married, we started having trouble. She had a boy friend for six months before I met her. I suppose that he was staying with her too. The first baby died when it was about a year old. Six months after we were married I'll tell you what happened. It was in the evening and we had just finished supper. She said, 'Go out of the house this evening if you want to.' I went out, but I thought I would watch. I saw a young man come in the house. When I went into the room, he got nervous. He said he was selling linens and wanted to get an order from my wife. But he

didn't have any satchel or samples with him. I thought to myself, 'If I had married a decent girl, it would have been different, but if she could be with me before we were married, she could be with someone else too.' I thought maybe boys were after her.

"Eleven years ago I found her one day tying up the milkman's head. He had his arms around her. The next child that was born had a cocky eye just like the milkman. Either the child was marked by the milkman or she stayed with him. . . . My oldest girl goes out and stays until nine o'clock. She goes with girl friends. Maybe I am too strict with her. I love her, but I worry about her because if her mother was that way, I am afraid she might be that way. I want her to be like my mother and not like my wife. I want her to be a good girl. I helped raise her myself on Mellon's food, but I don't want her to be like her mother."

The significance of pregnancy prior to marriage lies in the fact that it later comes to symbolize all that the husband finds in his wife which irritates him, regardless of how remotely these factors are connected with the fact of pregnancy. Furthermore, it enables him to rationalize his own behavior should he prove unfaithful in the marriage relationship. As one husband explained in telling of his wife's pregnancy at the time he married her: "You see I haven't much respect for her. I don't feel that I need be so careful. It is a game of each one by himself."

How the husband's suspicion that his wife had sexual relations prior to marriage colors most of their relations and symbolizes the inferiority of the wife and all her undesirable points is illustrated in the following case as told by Mr. T.:

"My wife was working when I married her. She had a pretty face. She looked so innocent that a person almost had to believe her. I had gone with different girls but I had not had any sex experience. One day I went to see my wife unexpectedly [she was not my wife then], and I saw the landlord coming out of her room. His wife and children were not at home. That made me suspect something, and later, after we were married, I became sure that she had had relations with this man. In spite of this she attracted me and I married her. . . . When I stayed with her the second night we were married, I found that she was not a virgin. When I told her, she explained to me that she had been attacked on the boat on the way over to this country,

and that she had been too ill to resist. She now denies that she ever told me this. I was so upset that I left her that night. Then I thought it over and decided that I would try to live with her. If everything else had been all right, I would have forgotten this. I am sure I am not the father of the twins. They were born on the twentieth day of the seventh month after we were married. The doctor told me that they were full-term babies. I am positive my wife was pregnant when I married her. I think it was the landlord. At the time when I saw him coming from her room, I talked to her about it. She appeared so innocent that I believed her. I have never been able to forget this because other things have reminded me of it. I have always liked her physically, and at first I enjoyed staying with her. But she made excuses and tried to spite me by not staying with me. . . .

"No one ever comes to our home because I am ashamed to bring my friends there. I enjoy talking with people and visiting with them, but it is impossible for any intelligent person to talk to my wife. We never go out together. My wife feels inferior to me. She feels that I keep her as a servant and that I don't like her. . . . She never reads a book. She is where she was when I married her.

"I really like the twins as much as I do the other child, only they seem to irritate me more. They would not know that I feel that I am not their father, if their mother hadn't talked before them and told them this. I have lost interest in my job. I might say that is the only thing I have been successful in, but now the job keeps me. I don't keep the job. My family life has been such a failure that being successful in my job has meant a great deal to me. Sometimes I think my wife is jealous of my having been successful. The boys where I work gave me a shaving set one time. Not very long ago I went home one evening and found that my wife had smashed it to pieces. We don't talk except to quarrel. She isn't capable of understanding. I go home at 10 or 11 P. M. I leave the office late. I eat my dinner in a restaurant, then I go to a show or to a friend's house. I drag the time along so that it will be bedtime when I get home. She doesn't ever make my bed. I have to do that every night when I go home. I often go to a movie not because I like them, but just to have some place to go to close my eyes and escape.

"For the last year I have been going to other women. I would rather do that than stay with her now."

It is clear that the conflict in the above case, though starting on a sex basis, is not due exclusively to sexual difficulties

but involves all relations between husband and wife which are thought to constitute the essential character of the family. This core of marriage relations seems to consist of intimate responsiveness to each other, with mutual identification of attitudes and interests.

This broadening of conflict from what is more strictly sex to the wider ranges of family relations is not, however, found alone in the case of the T.'s, but may be seen in varying degrees in many of the cases which have preceded. In these more expanded aspects, however, the sex factor becomes less and less important, though it does not entirely disappear. Under these circumstances conflicts can be more appropriately described in terms of *response* rather than in terms of *sex*.

CHAPTER X

THE RESPONSE-CONFLICT PATTERN

While it is true that sex sometimes becomes almost wholly dissociated from affection, love, and companionship, the tendency is more often in the opposite direction. Especially is this true in modern life, where romanticism furnishes a philosophy of sex sublimation. The result is, as has been seen, that even in those cases where domestic discord centers about sex conflict there tend to be associated many other factors, especially those already defined as response.

But just as sex conflict tends to broaden to include conflict in response relations, there are other situations in which response constitutes the essential elements in the conflict. Sex conflict is likely to be present also, but its significance is largely confined to its symbolization of dissatisfaction in the wider realm of response relations, implying, as it does, lack of identity of interests, aspirations, etc., which constitute such an essential part of response.

Adjustment in response relations is not, however, a condition suddenly achieved with the consummation of marriage, as the romantic philosophy seems to assume. Like sexual adjustment, harmonious response relations are the results of accommodation, into which some conflict inevitably enters. Part of this is due to the fact that the marriage partner is a substitute for earlier sources of response which may, or may not, have been wholly abandoned.

Attachments to other persons, members of one's own family, etc., tend, therefore, to impede accommodation since these imply failure on the part of the individual to recognize the monopolizing nature of response relations. One of the most important

of these situations is that involved in what is often referred to as the "in-law" problem.

The extent to which relations with the "in-laws" make for conflict is, of course, dependent to a large extent upon the number and intimacy of contacts. While in some instances the newly married couple may be on somewhat familiar terms with the "in-laws," in other instances they are practically strangers. In either case, close contacts tend to be provocative of conflict. This is understood when one considers that there is developed in every family a universe of discourse. Because of this, many things go on within the family which are not understandable to an outsider. Gestures, words, and phrases peculiar to the family itself, are understood only by its members.¹

The natural antipathy between "in-laws" is complicated by the preservation of the old custom of living with parents which is still widespread among peoples of certain social classes and especially the group studied. Where the husband is not established financially he often, upon marriage, takes his wife to live with his parents or goes to live with her parents.

The acquired member of the family, accordingly, feels himself an outsider, unable to participate or understand much of what goes on within the family circle. He is not, however, an outsider in the strict sense, since, if he were, situations would be controlled in the interest of making him feel at ease. Instead he is treated paradoxically both as a member and non-member of the family. Communication goes on within the family circle on the same basis as it did previous to his entrance. Nothing is done to make the situation intelligible to him since it is assumed that being a member of the family, this is not necessary. Thus he occupies the anomalous position of being both taken for granted and ignored.

The anomaly of the newcomer's position is further complicated by the fact that since the relationship between the husband and wife is new it is characterized by attitudes of recency and instability. This gives to the relations between

¹See E. R. Mowrer, *Family Disorganization*, pp. 3-4.

husband and wife a tentativeness which is quite different from the stability and security of parent-child relationships defined by long-established habit systems.

This situation is further complicated, also, where any member of the family resents the presence of the newcomer and where he is given little or no consideration in the formulation of policies which bear upon his own position and interests. It is a common experience for one parent, usually of the opposite sex, to look upon the newcomer as a rival for the affections and solicitations of the offspring. Conflict between a mother-in-law and daughter-in-law, for example, is not unusual. The mother, fearful lest her place be usurped by her rival, in some instances becomes even more demonstrative of affection and more demanding of attention from her son than she had been previously. As one wife explained, "My husband's mother never seemed to make over him until after he was married. Then she seemed to become more fond of him."

Under such circumstances, therefore, the wife becomes jealous of undue attention shown by her husband to his mother. Conflict arises when he continues to go to his mother for advice rather than consulting her, or shows what the wife considers to be undue solicitude as is illustrated in the following excerpt:

"My husband's family have always interfered in our affairs. His mother has always been against me. . . . My husband does such queer things. Sometimes he takes screws, handles, etc., from our house and takes them over to his mother's and fixes up her house. He never does anything like that for me."

Conflict is more intense, of course, if the son brings his wife to live in his mother's home. Here the two women are thrown together constantly, each feeling that the other is encroaching upon her preserve. Accommodation established long ago between mother and son, tends, under these circumstances, to continue without modification. The wife rebels against it partly because there seems to be implied in the continuation of this older situation a usurping of her privilege as a wife. This is illustrated in the case of Mrs. Z.:

"Since I have lived here with my husband's parents I have been miserable. My husband is good to me but I can't stand his mother. She is mean and hard to get along with.

"When my husband comes home she gives him his food and I have to stand and look at him while he eats. Then I feel that I am an outsider. I should be the one to wait on my husband, not his mother.

"I feel out of place here. It is a nice home and all that but I don't enjoy it. My husband pays more attention to his mother. He has all he wants to eat and has a wife—that is all he needs. His mother has a maid; that is, I am the maid, and that is all she needs.

"Sometimes she makes me so miserable. I feel that I am dependent upon her for what I eat. Sometimes she will make this remark, 'Is all the butter gone? Robert, did you eat the butter?' Or if there are two pancakes missing, 'Robert, did you eat them?' Robert is my little son, and she knows very well that he is too small to eat so much food. It is her way of accusing me.

"I take care of the house while my mother-in-law goes to card parties. There isn't a great deal of housework to do, no very hard work. But she will not allow me to cook. We often quarrel about this.

"My mother-in-law reminds me ever so often that I have married into a rich family and that I should be satisfied. I would rather live in one room than here with his family."

While the wife's feeling of being outside the family circle is heightened by her position in her mother-in-law's home, this feeling, however, does not disappear once she moves into a home of her own. A crisis in the filio-parental relationship usually precipitates the move. Following a period of strained relations, the son is usually more quickly and wholeheartedly forgiven than is the daughter-in-law. The result is that the husband may resume contact with his family, the wife continuing in the role of an outsider. The details of the husband's visits to his family are often imaginatively filled in by the wife. Upon his return home, therefore, she believes he acts differently toward her. "My husband is always different after he has been

to his mother's; he is like a changed man toward me when he comes home; she teaches him to do things against me," explained a wife in discussing her problem. This attitude naturally leads to strained relations between husband and wife, until the occasion of each visit of the husband to his family becomes symbolic of an ever-widening breach between them.

Another situation creating conflict is that where either one parent or both live with the couple. It is more common to find a mother living with her married son or married daughter. In such situations the son-in-law or daughter-in-law, whichever the case may be, often feels that the mother-in-law is regulating the household as if it were her own. This person, therefore, becomes as much an outsider as if he were living in his "in-laws' " home. A husband, for example, finding that he must defer his wishes to his mother-in-law and to his wife, feels a depreciation of his personality. This is what occurred in the following situation, as related by the husband:

"My mother-in-law tries to step on me. She lives with us. She likes to run the house. . . . She likes respect but she doesn't give respect. She is an old troublemaker. . . . I have to bend my head to my boss because I have to make a living, but not to my wife and mother-in-law. . . . All I want is to be a boss in my own home."

In other situations conflict centers around the presence of a brother or sister in the home, who assumes the role of a parent, in extreme cases usurping the role of the husband. The position in which the husband finds himself is typically portrayed in the X. case:

Mrs. X. was next to the youngest of a family, of four children, two girls and two boys. None of the children has married except Mrs. X. although all are considerably past the marriageable age.

Mrs. X. has been throughout her married life in close contact with her relatives. One brother has made his home with the family for seven years. Her sister has lived with them for short periods of two to three months during the past five years.

The older brother living with the family speaks of himself as having paid the rent for years although in reality he has simply paid his board and room of \$12.00 a week. He has placed his name on the mail box instead of the husband's. He has constantly interfered in supervision of the children.

"I married my wife," Mr. X. said, "because she was anxious to marry me and I was anxious to get married. She was eight years older than I was but that didn't make any difference at that time. I was old for my age and had had more experience. We got along very well at first. Then her folks started interfering, telling me what I should do and why I didn't make more money. Whenever I spoke of getting my own business, her brother said, 'You are not a business man. What will you do in business?' When I started to borrow money to buy a store, my wife said, 'You stay where you are. You are no business man, so don't try to be something you aren't.'

"I worked late until 9 or 10 P. M. except one evening a week. I had to eat in the restaurant part of the time. When I went home I had to eat alone on the edge of the table. My wife, children, and her brother always had their meals at six or seven o'clock. . . .

"I felt just like a boarder in the house, not like a husband. I ate my meals alone. My brother-in-law even took out my children on Sunday. He told my wife what price flat she should move into. They looked at me like a dog. I won't go back unless I can be more than a boarder in my own home."

The fact that Mrs. X.'s brother lived in the home is not, of course, particularly important, though contrary to popular opinion, as was demonstrated by what happened subsequently. When the older brother, who had previously assumed the superior role in the family, moved out of the home, a second brother and a sister, though not living with the family, assumed to a lesser degree the position vacated by the older brother.

In situations like that represented in the X. case, whether a brother or sister actually lives in the home or not, his role is that of an active participant in the family's affairs, in which he usurps in certain ways the position of the husband. This situation is, of course, sufficiently irritating to the husband because it deprives him of the response which he would normally

receive. When, however, there is added to the situation an attempt on the part of the wife's brother or sister to discipline the husband, as in the C. case, conflict becomes more acute:

"My brother," said Mrs. C., "has kept in close contact with my whole situation. He hates my husband and thinks he should take better care of me. When I returned to my husband I made him sign a written pledge that he would be good and take care of me. About three weeks ago I gave this pledge to my brother. He wrote my husband a letter reminding him of the pledge he had made. My husband was very angry and told me that I had played false with him, as I was supposed to keep the pledge myself. He felt that my brother should keep out of our affairs and said that my brother could not boss him."

"My wife's brother," said Mr. C., "has always interfered. He has acted more like a father to her than a brother. He is about fifty-five years old and is a bachelor. After the birth of our first child my brother-in-law called me aside one day and said, 'You are a pig, having so many children. . . .'

"The other day he wrote me this letter. It is not the first one I have received. When I got it I was so mad that I decided to leave home. Here is the gist of the letter:

"I would like to know why you allow your wife only \$25.00 a week. Do you really think she can manage to feed five mouths with so little money? Do you intend to keep that up? . . . Must your wife constantly run to borrow a dime here and quarter there? Have you lost all the pride of manhood? The lowest, meanest of men would not do what you do. Do you save some money? I believe you do. Do you believe by being a liar, a miser, an egotist, you will gain the love of your children when they reach eighteen years? I want to know how much you are making. . . ."

Another phase of the in-law problem is that in which certain factors with reference to the larger family group serve as a basis for rationalization of elements in the response conflict. These elements, of course, are often not recognized by the individual himself though he is dissatisfied with marriage relations. Or, when recognized, they take on a larger meaning through the process of rationalization. Thus a person may see

in his marriage partner certain traits resembling those of the parent for whom he has a strong dislike. Because he appears to resemble the parent in one respect, the person reasons that he must resemble him in all respects. Thus he is able to justify his irritation since it is directed as much toward the parent as toward the husband or wife whose personality has become identified with that of the parent.

This discovery of similarity between the marriage partner and his parent often, of course, succeeds an earlier process in which traits producing irritation are projected upon the parent. Since in every marriage relationship there tend to be some characteristics of the husband or wife which call out hate reactions, in the interests of idealization these are projected upon another personality. The parent of the person in question becomes naturally the most convenient scapegoat. Discovery of undesirable traits, therefore, by which conflict may be rationalized may often be nothing more than a rediscovery of these projected characteristics.

While it is probably much more common to find a projection of traits upon one member of the family, the mechanism may, of course, take the form of projection upon the whole family group. Thus one may hear a wife say, "My husband is just like his family. None of them is any good. It runs in the blood."

Another common mechanism is that in which projection is again involved, but this time the relatives become the scapegoat by being blamed for the conflict between husband and wife. For instance, a husband may rationalize his own inability to cope with the situation by saying, "My wife would be a good wife if her mother would let us alone. She teaches her to be bad."

On the other hand, rationalizations often take the form of invidious comparisons between the conduct of the marriage partner and that of one's family. The wife, for example, may complain that her husband does not remember her birthdays and their wedding anniversaries as do members of her family. Often, of course, this comparison may either result in, or be the result of, an attempt on the part of the wife to compensate

for lack of response on the part of the husband through contacts with her family. In fact, it is not uncommon to observe one marriage partner developing more close contacts with his family as a reaction to a close filio-parental relationship on the part of the other person.

While attachments to other persons, especially to members of one's own family, tend to impede accommodation because they compete with the marriage partner for affection and loyalty, this is not the only source of response conflict. Differences in interests, likewise, tend to become personified and, therefore, seem in competition with the marriage partner for the response of the other. This is particularly well illustrated in the T. case, where the husband becomes more introspective and spends much of his leisure time in reading:

Mrs. T. spent her early girlhood in Europe, coming to America at the age of thirteen. She lived with her parents until her marriage to Mr. T. at the age of nineteen.

Mr. T. spent his early life in Europe, coming to America when he was about twenty-one years old.

FAMILY ORGANIZATION

Mrs. T. was the fourth oldest of a family of nine children—six girls and three boys. Two brothers are married and living in the West. The five sisters all live in the East. All are happily married except the oldest sister, who is divorced, her husband having been a gambler. Mrs. T. says, "All my sisters and brothers have their own homes and maids except the sister who is divorced."

Mrs. T. was particularly fond of her father who always tried to please her. "I was named after my father's grandmother. I remember when I was a little girl I used to sleep with my father. I was the youngest of the girls. My father was a fine business man and brought me pretty things."

There has been a strong attachment between the members of Mrs. T.'s family. Two older sisters first came to America; a few months later the father came with another daughter. Mrs. T., her mother, and two younger sisters were the last to come here. Mrs. T. says, "My older sister used to walk to work to save money to send for us."

Mr. T. was the fourth oldest in a family of eight children—four girls and four boys. The father died in Europe; two sisters and one brother are living in Chicago. Mr. T. says that he was his mother's favorite child, as he understood her better than did the other children. "I always thought my mother deserved more attention. I was the one who brought her to America."

According to Mr. T. the members of his family were always on friendly terms, but were not dependent upon each other—i.e., each went his own way.

CULTURAL PATTERNS

Mrs. T. was taught Russian by a teacher in the home. She has attended night school in America. She reads English and speaks it quite fluently. She seems thoroughly Americanized. The father manufactured plows in Europe and made a good living. He owned two houses and four blocks of land. Mrs. T. says, "There were many people in the town where we lived who liked us. I used to play and skate with refined people—some were children of generals. I hated the peasants."

Upon arriving in this country at the age of thirteen, Mrs. T. went to work in a shirt factory. She later worked in a department store, where she became forewoman, earning \$20.00 and \$25.00 a week.

Before her marriage Mrs. T. usually went to parties and shows with her sisters. She had few boy friends. She says, "I was full of life and liked a good time. I spent my vacations at resorts."

Mr. T.'s father was a butcher in Europe. He made a fair living. Mr. T. attended a theological school for five years. When he was thirteen years old, he was apprenticed to a tailor.

Mr. T. learned to read and write Russian and, upon coming to America, learned to read and write English. He became a citizen. He has always been interested in the drama, music, and literature. He likes to attend lectures and is interested in reading books in the fields of psychology, sociology, biology, physiology, anthropology, etc. He is fond of the outdoors and talks reminiscently of "the little farm in Europe located in a small village" where he spent his boyhood.

Mr. T. has no patience with religion and speaks of himself as an infidel.

SOCIAL INTERACTION

A. *Factors in Adjustment and Conflict between Family and Community*

1. *Economic.* Upon coming to America Mr. T. secured work as a tailor. After six or seven years, he saved enough money to establish his own shop, in the downtown business district, which he has conducted for the past twenty-two years. During the busy season he keeps a helper. He averages about \$35.00 a week.

Mr. T. says that tailoring does not interest him, but now it is too late for him to learn anything else. During his slack season he reads a great deal. He says, "I would rather have been a professor or a lawyer."

2. *Health.* Mrs. T. had a tumor of the womb, which was removed two years ago. An ovarian operation was performed at the same time.

Mr. T. has had ulcers of the stomach and must constantly adhere to a diet.

The older child, Katherine, is poorly nourished. Her posture is poor, as is also her motor control. She has constantly been under the care of physicians.

Mary, the younger child, has a "congenital dislocation of both hips and spastic hemiplegia of the right side," according to a diagnosis made by a private physician. She has been under the care of local physicians and the Mayo Clinic of Rochester.

3. *Sex.* Mr. T. does not deny having sexual relations with other women, but says, "That is too personal a question."
4. *Cultural.* Mrs. T. recently became a member of a lodge. She is in close contact with her relatives and has some friends who encourage her to go out with them. Mrs. T. says that she craves the excitement of "going places."

Mr. T. has few close friends. His contacts are mostly of the secondary type. He likes to read, to go to the Art Institute,

to the opera, and to see a good play. He particularly likes symphony concerts. He always goes to these places alone. He does not like the movies.

Mr. T. is a member of a biological society. There he makes the acquaintance of people and discusses various topics with them. He says he likes only the companionship of "intellectual people."

Mr. T.'s reading has consisted for example of Herbert Spencer's "Diary"; works of Darwin, Shakespeare, Emerson; some sociology; and some Chinese philosophy. He is particularly fond of the works of Bertrand Russell and George A. Dorsey.

5. *Pattern of Life.* Mrs. T. is intelligent. She is quick in her reactions. She is vivacious. Friends mean a great deal to her. She is not introspective, but lives in her associations. She craves excitement and speaks of "leading my own life for the first time in twenty years."

Mr. T. is intelligent, frank, and straightforward. He is calm, well poised, and gives the impression of being "polished." He has a fatalistic attitude toward life, saying, "There is very little happiness in this world; this is life. We must accept situations."

Mr. T. feels a definite intellectual superiority toward his wife. He thinks that she cannot be changed, "because our ways of thinking are different." He is introspective. He "keeps to himself" and dislikes crowds.

B. *Factors in Adjustment and Conflict within Family Group*

1. *Economic.* Mrs. T. regards her husband as "stingy," saying, "During the slack season he is like a miser. He gives me \$18.00 a week and sometimes \$20.00. I can't live on that. We have to have lamb chops, vegetables, and the children have to have cod liver oil. We are all on diets."

Mrs. T. says that her husband has always had a good trade and made a good living. "When the children were small and I was a good wife to him, we saved—now it is different. We quarrel about money now."

2. *Health.* Mrs. T. says that her husband is particular about his food. "Something makes him irritated. I can't cook for him. I am a good cook, though. Of course, it may be because of his ulcers."

Mrs. T. tells her husband that the child Mary is a "cripple" through him. She resents the fact that her husband refuses to go out with the children, particularly with Mary, saying he will not go with a wheel chair. She says, "Every day he is free and I give treatments, and it is all through him. I must bathe the children. I must dress Mary. I must take her to the doctor. He won't help me. I am a young woman. I want to live, and yet I feel sorry for the children."

3. *Sex.* The couple had sexual relations on their wedding night. Mrs. T. describes vividly what occurred on that night. She knew little about sex and was shocked when she discovered what marriage meant. The next day, "I felt crushed and sick. When I told my mother, she told me that was marriage. I remember I replied that if I had known that before, I would not have married."

During the first three months of marriage, the couple had sexual relations every night; later, once or twice a week. Mrs. T. says her husband never satisfied her.

Since April Mr. and Mrs. T. have not had intimate contacts. Mrs. T. says she desires them, while her husband explains that he refuses in order "to punish her and make her respect him."

Mrs. T. refuses to discuss sex hygiene with her husband because she identifies these ideas with the rest of his reading, which she does not understand.

4. *Cultural.* Mrs. T. says she craves the excitement of "going places," but that her husband never takes her out. She says, "He is not interested in amusement—he must have his books."

Mrs. T. complains that her husband feels superior to everyone else—particularly her friends and herself. "He is not interested in people; he wants to run away from people. He likes to read or to go to the fields alone. I am different. I am a sociable person. I want people to like me."

Mrs. T. displays a definite bitterness to all her husband's reading, of which she is not a part. She says, "I talk to my husband, but he gives me an answer out of a book, something I can't understand."

Mrs. T. says that dress means a great deal to her husband and that he always appears well-groomed. "But he is not interested in what I wear because he wants me to look older than him." (Mr. T. is eleven years older than his wife.)

RATIONALIZATIONS

Mrs. T. tells the following:

"My parents had a nice home. I always went places with my sisters. Friends used to come to my parents. I liked them, but they never took me out. I met my husband's brother-in-law first. He liked me, but he said that I was too dark. Through him I met my husband. I was nineteen. I knew him about eight or nine months. He was thirty years old. The month before we were to be married, he told me that he did not believe in a ceremony, religion, or a wedding ring. I liked his appearance. I never sold myself for money. I married for love.

"My parents made a big wedding—there were a hundred people. Three weeks before we married we fixed up a flat. Through his brother he bought furniture.

"I had always been a bashful girl. We had relations the first night we were married. He was like a Russian peasant. I hate a Russian man—I guess it is because my husband is one. He didn't explain anything to me. He got up later and struck a match and looked in the bed. I didn't understand what that meant. When daylight came, he left the house. I hated it. When my mother came she told me that was marriage. I told her, 'Why didn't you tell me that before; I wouldn't have married.' It was two weeks before we were together again; then it was every night. I got over my feeling of hating it, except I thought he was so crude. I never felt satisfied; I was full of life. He was only interested in his own satisfaction. When I showed interest he would say he was too tired.

"Three months after we were married I got pregnant. He was so anxious that I have a child. I guess he worried because he thought that he couldn't have any. Then three months after the baby was

born I became ill. I was run down; marriage had been too much for me. The baby died while I was in the hospital. I felt bad about it, but I accepted it. The third day I was home I asked for my husband. The third day he had intercourse with me. I didn't take the baby's death hard, I was so happy to be home. For that year we lived with my mother. Then Katherine was born—she was a blue baby. She used to cry and faint.

"We had trouble about bringing up the baby. He said that he read in books that the baby shouldn't cry. I told him if he was such a philosopher, he should find out why the baby cries. He wanted to have a baby, but he said, 'Wouldn't it be wonderful if I could live with you and not have babies?'

"Mary was born with a hip dislocation. Her hip drained for a year and a half.

"He reads books. He told me that he had read in a book how we should have intercourse. I wouldn't listen to him. Since April we haven't been together. We slept together for five months without having intimate contacts. Now I sleep with Katherine. Since Mary was born we have had relations about once in three months. I have told him that I can't live a life like this. I have asked him why he is so cold toward me. His sister gives him wine to make him more lively. He eats steak, also, but that makes him sick. [He has ulcers.] About six years ago he had ulcers. He has to stay on diet.

"If you ask him things, he gives you an answer that you can't understand.

"We don't go out together. It has been a year and a half since we have been to his relatives. His sister gives him sympathy. His mother always liked me.

"He won't go with Mary in the wheel chair. Every day he is free. He goes; I give treatments. I have taken Mary everywhere. I have given her treatments. I have dressed her hip for years. I have to rub her with alcohol. She is a great care. He has never helped me. I have lived through one operation with her after another. I feel that I cannot live through another one.

"I crave so much to see excitement. On New Year's I went with some friends to a dance. I whistled and laughed and felt like a different person. I am still a young woman.

"He felt nice when my people cared for him. He has always felt superior to everyone else. My mother hasn't talked to him for five years.

"He has himself to blame. If he was a God and he was good to me, then he would be my God.

"I like people. He likes to go to the fields, where he will see no one. He likes to read. He doesn't talk much. I used to cry, but my circumstances taught me.

"Katherine is a sweet child. Sometimes I take walks with her. She can't keep up with me. Mary doesn't like her father. After all she is a lovable child. Katherine likes people who are good to her.

"It is all his fault that Mary is the way she is. Then he tells me, 'Go have some more like that.' I would be glad if the time ever comes when people have to go and have physical examinations before they are married.

"It was different when the children were small and I made dresses and I saved. Now they need to have big clothes. Every night I have to give them treatments and exercise their arms. One needs a maid to care for Mary. I would like to put her in an institution. I would be so happy if those two girls could ever take care of themselves. If they could just get an ordinary job!

"Sometimes I feel that I am sinking. I can earn money. I am a sociable person—people like me. I must get out."

Mr. T. tells the following:

"When I came to America, at first I was disgusted. I didn't know the language. First the immigrant is always disappointed. He thinks he will get rich and go back. Then he gets used to it, and then he doesn't want to go back. I suffered like other immigrants, I suppose, but I managed to save some money and I started a little business of my own. I have had it for twenty-two years. I would rather have been a professor or a lawyer.

"I could read and write Russian when I came here. I picked up English fast; I didn't go to school. I was always interested in music and drama. I have always liked to read, but as the years have gone on I guess I have read more. I liked to read from a bit of every-

thing—biology, sociology, psychology, anthropology, philosophy—everything I can get my hands on. I like to go to the public library.

"I haven't had a systematic education. I am not an educated man, but I have learned a great deal from reading. I don't care for most people. I just like intellectual people. I belong to a biological society. I like to meet people there and discuss topics with them.

"I was in this country seven or eight years when I met my wife. At that time I thought all that a man can expect from a woman is to cook and keep house. I guess I was the average boy at that time and she was the average girl. I felt that I didn't have a right to expect more. She was not an attractive girl, but somehow I don't know, I thought she met with the requirements, i.e., that she would be a good cook and a good housekeeper, and I thought that's all women could be. I wanted a home; before that I had lived in a room.

"Even before I married her, I noticed that she had a great many fears. She was afraid to be in a room by herself. She didn't like to sleep by herself.

"She did not refuse to have sex relations with me. We stayed together (it has been so long, I can't quite recall) three or four times a week. To be frank, she cared for me much more than I cared for her. She cared for me physically.

"During the first year we were married she cried a great deal and she was nervous. Three months after the baby was born she had to go to the hospital.

"When the second child was born, she seemed physically normal but slow in development. This child was born a cripple. She, of course, blames me for this. I have never been infected. I don't accuse her, neither do I blame myself. Who can tell about those things? After all the doctors don't agree. I have read books and very little is known.

"I don't have intercourse with her now. I don't object to her physically, but my conscience objects to her. When she gets the desire, she is kind. She makes promises. After that she comes to the same point again. She gets cruel again. So I leave her alone as a punishment, then she respects me. She is emotional. She wants me. I would not refuse her if she would be less cruel to me, but I will not acquiesce and the next day have her at the same point again.

"If I have an intellectual person. I like to talk to him. Such people as baseball pitchers and moving picture actresses do not interest me. My friends are not her friends. People never come to the house. My friends I meet at meetings. We do not go out together. We are not interested in the same things. She likes movies; I like dramas. She does not care for an opera or a symphony concert. We are different.

"I do not eat at home because she does not fix meals for me. I have stomach trouble and I must eat fruits and vegetables. She does it for revenge. She tells me, 'You like my cooking; that is the reason I don't cook.' She neglects my linen. My stomach trouble does not bother me so much now. Since I got on my feet, I went my own way.

"I learned sex hygiene in the theological school when I was nine years old. She knows nothing of it. She will not let me discuss it with her.

"I feel it is my moral duty to take care of the children. They are not responsible in this act. I feel sorry for them. The children, I think, dislike me. That is because they are brought up with her and the children are always closer to the mother.

"I cannot discuss topics with her. I can hardly read at home because of the noise. Instead I go to the public library, even on Sunday.

"It is just fate. There is very little happiness in this world. I accept the situation; others have unhappiness too. I am suffering, but I feel sorry for her, and I feel sorry for myself. I don't blame her. We are both to blame. I see things as they are. If I could only put a new head on her, possibly things would be different."

At the beginning of marriage, the T.'s had varying conceptions of family life. The husband, of wider experience than his wife, felt that a great deal could not be expected of a woman other than being a good cook and housekeeper. Her intellectual qualifications, therefore, were not taken into account. The wife's outlook, on the other hand, was more romantic than her husband's. She was marrying for love, affection, and comradeship.

Conflict arises almost immediately out of the difference in knowledge of and attitudes toward sex—the husband identifying marriage with sex relations; the wife, on the other hand,

viewing it in its more romantic aspects. The impersonal attitude of the husband both shocks and irritates her.

Although having had a superior family background in Europe to that of her husband, Mrs. T. shows no interest in his reading and intellectual aspirations. As time goes on, she develops a definite bitterness and jealousy for her husband's reading. His suggestions, secured from books for care of their child, are rejected as is also his advice regarding sex hygiene, because these are a part of a world to which the wife does not belong.

What in the beginning seemed like only a difference in natural inclinations develops into an almost complete differentiation of interests. These differences in some instances seem to represent negativistic reactions to the interests of the other, such as, the husband's preference for solitude as against the wife's liking for crowds and excitement, the wife's desire for close personal contacts with friends versus her husband's desire for secondary contacts, etc. The result is to undermine the basic *rappport* without which response relations cannot exist.

Conflict in response relations in the T. case is further complicated by other elements which tend to symbolize lack of adjustment in response. The husband's alleged sexual irregularities, for example, are thought by the wife to be responsible for their child's deficiency. The necessity for constant care of the child is placed upon the wife by the husband who refuses to be seen with a wheel chair, for to do so would in his mind constitute acknowledgment of responsibility for the child's condition. This his wife resents, not only because in this way he denies responsibility for the child's condition, but also because it represents a refusal to share in the care of the children.

The sex conflict in this case is constantly being interpreted by both the husband and wife in terms of other elements in the situation. To the wife, the husband's refusal to have sex relations symbolizes earlier irregularities, for otherwise what explanation is there for his lessened sexual desire? The hus-

band, on the other hand, finds inconsistency in his wife's solicitude and submission in sex relations as compared with her domineering and unresponsive attitudes at other times.

Another element in the conflict situation is the identification of Mrs. T. with the children, especially the older child. This identification causes her to feel that any lack of solicitude for the children applies equally to herself.

Identification between a wife and children also frequently provides a medium for the sublimation of her desire for response. This grows out of the fact that since her contacts and interests are more restricted to the home, this avenue of sublimation is more available to her than any other. The situation is, of course, quite different in the case of the husband, whose contacts with the children tend to be overshadowed by those in the community. The wife's situation, on the other hand, is often that portrayed in the following excerpt:

"I have no one. I stay inside all day and think about my trouble. I have so few friends I can talk to. I cry. I tell my baby all my troubles. I tell her all about the difficulty we are having. She is so small, but she understands. I must tell it to someone. The way she looks up at me I know she sympathizes with me."

Sublimation of response through contacts with children, however, tends to increase rather than minimize conflict. Even in cases where this sublimation has grown out of what to the wife appears to be neglect on the part of her husband, it tends to result in further differentiation of interests. As time goes on, the husband tends eventually to come to the conclusion that his only function in the home is that of providing support. He tends, therefore, to turn to other sources for satisfaction of response, which leads to complete breakdown of family unity.

In other cases the husband becomes jealous of his wife's attentions to the children. He finds little satisfaction of the desire for response from his wife because her attention has become completely absorbed in her relations with her children. How this situation is reacted to on the part of the

husband may be seen in the case of the L.'s. Here the husband feels more keenly the loss of attention transferred to the children since he earlier was the recipient of it:

"When we got married," said Mrs. L., "I wanted him to be everything to me . . . I wanted to have a home and a husband as a friend. I thought we would do everything together. . . .

"He never treated me right. We argued about money. He never wanted me to go out with him. He thought only of himself. . . .

"As time went on, I became more independent. I had my children. I pay a great deal of attention to my children. He is jealous and says that he is just the boarder. He likes attention. He wants someone to pet him, give him his hat, and straighten his tie. I used to do that but now I give it to the children. When the children hurt themselves, I give them attention. Then he says, 'You don't pay attention to me. You don't care for me.' He wants everyone to look at him.

"He doesn't eat breakfast at home. I don't get up and give it to him. He often eats dinner alone. Why should I wait on him?"

"After the first child was born," said Mr. L., "my wife said she didn't care for a husband. . . . She always thinks I don't give her enough money. . . . I like a home. I like to have a nice home, to have my buttons sewed on my clothes, and to have a wife pay some attention to me and be a wife to me. I feel up against everything as it is. No matter how much money I give her she says it isn't enough. No matter what I do for her she doesn't pay any attention to me. I could have married plenty of girls. Now she tells me she didn't like me from the first. She tells me if I don't like it, I can leave the home. She says she can get along without me, and that she is just standing me until the children grow up. Then she will go with the children."

Response conflict arises, as has been seen, out of a variety of situations where for one reason or another there is lack of satisfaction of the desire for response. Since such conflict results in a segregation of interests and contacts, there tends to develop a widening gulf between the lives of the two persons. This later phase of conflict is, however, more appropriately described as cultural conflict, though it may often be closely related to conflict in response relations.

CHAPTER XI

CULTURAL CONFLICT

American culture in its glorification of love and affection as the basis of marriage has tended to minimize the importance of cultural differences in the causation of domestic discord. The result is that these differences tend more often to provide a basis for rationalization than a point of origin of conflict in marriage relations. It is necessary, accordingly, in the analysis of cases involving cultural differences to be constantly on the lookout for other conflicts which are more basic than the cultural. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that cultural differences are more basic where the persons do not participate so completely in the romantic pattern, since under these conditions greater premium is placed upon cultural identification.

All conflicts, of course, may be thought of as essentially cultural since all patterns of behavior reflect the cultural form whether in regard to sex relations, response relations, or other relations involved in married life. While it is necessary to assume a substratum or basis in original nature, these elements are always overlaid by acquisitions reflecting the culture of the group. As was seen in the preceding chapters, sex conflict, for example, grows out of broader elements than the innate sex attitudes. While it is necessary to assume a basis of sex behavior in the inherited make-up of the individual, these inherent attitudes are always greatly modified by the culture of the group into which the individual is born. Accordingly, much of sex conflict has been discussed under conflict in response relations which emphasizes this cultural aspect of sex.

On the other hand, there are those phases of marriage

relations which are cultural in a more restricted sense. Conflict in this realm grows out of differences in folkways and mores of the groups in which the individuals grew up. Differences in food habits, dress, mannerisms, language, standards of conduct, education, religion, etc., make for conflict in varying degrees of intensity, depending upon the extent of diversity of these combining cultural elements. Cultural differences of this sort give rise to conflict largely because they symbolize obstacles to, or lack of, identification of the individuals concerned. Thus conflicts may arise out of cultural differences existing at the time of marriage, as in cases of intermarriage, for example. Here conflict may become extreme and overshadow the whole of the marriage relationship if the cultural backgrounds of the husband and wife are widely different and if their sympathies and beliefs are divergent and colored by different personal interests.

While it is true that these cultural differences are present at the time of marriage, they do not necessarily give rise to immediate conflict, because they are usually suppressed. Suppression is in the interest of the realization of a romantic ideal or of a more practical aspiration, whichever happens to be looked upon by the particular cultural group as essential for marriage relations.

Conflict arises in connection with cultural differences which have an emotional setting. These are largely a matter of early prejudices and aversions. In this emotional realm conflict takes on a symbolic character. The individual responds not only to the immediate situation but to the whole complex of past experiences and associations which are revived. For example, while the cross may be an object of sentimental respect for a non-Jew; for an orthodox Russian Jew the same cross may be an object of hatred—a symbol of ages of persecution. To have this symbol in the foreground is ever to create conflict for the orthodox Jew, while the unorthodox will view it with indifference.

While some cultural conflict may appear in all situations of intermarriage, one would expect it to be more exaggerated

where marriage occurs between two individuals belonging to groups with wide cultural differences—for example, Jewish and non-Jewish. Intimate contact of the two different cultures of the Jew and non-Jew implies an element of tension and the probability of its release in conflict. Naturally the degree of this tension will depend not only upon the intimacy of contact, but also upon the extent of diversity of the combining elements. A lesser degree of conflict will exist between a Jew and non-Jew both of whose cultures are essentially American, whose religions and intellectual interests are principally the same, and who are held together by common bonds of association, sympathies, and interests. In these instances many phases of the experience of the two groups are essentially alike. On the other hand, more extreme conflict will undoubtedly exist between a Jew and non-Jew whose cultural backgrounds are widely different and beliefs and ideals divergent.

How conflict becomes centered around this divergence in folkways, mores, conventions, ideals, etc., is illustrated in the case of Mrs. U.:

"I was born in Chicago and lived here until I was fourteen years old.

"I was the oldest of a family of fourteen children. Only four are living—two boys and two girls. My father was my mother's cousin. They had been married in Europe. My father was twelve years older than my mother. When I was fourteen, my father took a homestead of one hundred and sixty acres in Montana, and the family moved there. We were thirty miles from any town. My home life was very unhappy. There was constant quarrelling in the home between my parents. My mother said my father was interested only in saving money. My mother cooked, did all her own baking, had one child after another, and complained constantly. The children died because of lack of proper medical care.

"There was twelve years difference between me and the next living child—a boy. Because I was the oldest, and because I was so big and strong, I was given the work which would ordinarily be done by a hired man. Not only was it hard to find a man, but my father believed in saving money in order to make the homestead pay. I pitched hay during harvest time, cut wheat and flax, and milked the

cows the year around. My father expected me to do everything, no matter how rough. I saw how he treated me and how he treated my mother. My mother and father were of the same blood (my father was my mother's cousin). I thought if a man treats his own blood that way, how will a person be treated by an outsider. I felt sorry for my mother, but I did not like her. She always worked hard and has had only unhappiness.

"I worked hard for fourteen years. When I was twenty-one I returned with my family to Chicago; my mother and father then separated. I never expected much out of life. I hated my father and thought all men were the same. I usually worked in a mail order house because I couldn't work in a store. I didn't have the pretty clothes to wear and anyway I was too heavy on my feet. I never liked crowds. I never liked to go downtown. I preferred the country. Even now some days I feel that I must get out of doors in order to breathe. I like cold weather.

"I never had any friends. I didn't try to make friends because my home was unattractive. We lived in a rear flat. We had no piano. I didn't want to invite girls to my house and then have them talk about me when they saw our poverty. Then, too, I was twenty-one years old when we came back to Chicago. The neighbor girls were about fifteen, so I could not make friends with them. I was overgrown. When I was about twenty, I looked thirty. So I didn't have any girl friends because I couldn't find a girl of the type I wanted. I didn't want to associate with a poor girl. I would rather be alone, and a rich girl wouldn't look at me. So I realized it was impossible for me to have any companions.

"Sometimes I hated to go alone, but I never went to a show or to a dance. I only took walks. I was an awkward girl and I was sensitive about my looks. I never had any pretty clothes. I was big and overgrown. I never was invited anywhere and I didn't expect it.

"Then when I was about thirty-one I met a man—a Russian Jew. He had been married before to a Gentile. He was good-looking, but he was not serious. He seemed like a boy. He liked to play ball and go to dances. He didn't take life seriously. His parents thought that since I was a home girl that I would make him a nice wife, and that if I would marry him he would settle down and not be wild. I married him. It was a business proposition. I wanted a home. I was miserable in my own home. My mother and father were separated. My mother was brooding over her troubles. She had never

known anything much better in life, but she kept saying, "To think that your father left me after all these years!" My mother didn't belong to anything. She always worked. She wasn't well. She had rheumatism, then change of life came. Things began to pile up. The two boys got out of the home. I was the only one left. Everything that happened—everything she thought about—my mother told me.

"So I talked things over with the man's parents and we were married. I was a virgin. I knew nothing about men. I never had had a boy friend. He did not care for me. He took me to live with his mother. We lived together six weeks. I saw it was all a mistake; that he was a sport and I was only a plain girl. The two of us talked things over in a perfectly nice way and decided to separate. I talked things over with his parents. They wished me happiness if I ever married again. I got my divorce, after living with him six weeks. I had not expected much anyway. We had had sexual relations, but I did not get pregnant. During that six weeks, I worked every day at my regular job, while my husband stayed in bed. I had married him in the first place to have a home.

"I continued with my work; then I went back to live with my mother. Then the next year I met Mr. U. A lady who lived on the same street, introduced me to him. Her husband was a painter, and he sometimes brought Mr. U. to his house. He made a good impression and the lady thought he would make me a good husband. Later I found out that Mr. U. told her that if she secured a wife for him, he would buy her a new silk dress; so by fixing up the match, she got a dress. But I was tired to death of my work. It was a grind day after day. It meant punching a clock in the morning, being bawled out if I was ever late, having to think of some excuse to make. I felt penned up. The grind was getting on my nerves. Although my marriage the first time was a failure, I thought I would take a chance the second time. Again it was a business proposition. I thought to myself, I won't lose anything by marrying. I have had no chances in life. Things can't be worse than they are now. I had no chances to marry. Everyone thought that I should marry a widower, so I really married Mr. U. because he had no children. He was a Persian. I was not brought up in a religious home. We had been isolated from Jews. We had no religion.

"Although I was anxious to get married to escape the grind, I felt that if there was no chance of marriage for me, I would simply have

to go on working another fourteen or fifteen years. I already had \$2200.00 saved up. I was so miserable at home. I didn't mind the days I worked, but I hated Sunday. I was sick at heart—always sitting around the house just like I was a cripple. So I married for better or worse. I thought it couldn't be worse. I didn't like Mr. U.'s ways or his looks, but again it was a business proposition. I thought at least I would have a decent home.

"We took a flat. I thought I would manage somehow. I did have a picture in my mind of a man I would like to have married. I thought of him as slim, American-born, taller and bigger than me—a man who was a voter. Mr. U. was far away from measuring up to this picture.

"I soon learned that I had made a mistake. I couldn't stand his Persian friends. They believe that the men are the sole owners of the household and must carry the pocketbook. I had been used to being independent and carrying my own pocketbook.

"I didn't tell my husband my right age. I am three years older than he thinks I am. The Persians think a girl should marry at sixteen, and if they don't marry then, there is something wrong with them.

"When I married Mr. U., he was a union man, making \$71.50 a week. That is what I fell for. The first year he worked steadily. He worked for his Persian friends. As long as he worked for the Persians, he got along all right.

"The trouble with these people is that they don't ever make any progress. They have such queer ideas. They walk into your house without knocking at any time of the day or night. They are opposed to American women. They make wine and buy automobiles, and don't know how to save. You must be friendly with them and visit back and forth. It is an insult to go to a Persian's house and then say you must leave. They tried to make me do as they did. My husband told me that he wouldn't have married me if he didn't think he could train me to his way of doing things.

"Soon after marriage his Persian friends called upon me. At that time my husband knew twenty-five Persian families. I hated their clannishness and the way in which they made my business their own. I felt I did not understand these people. I had always hated foreigners. Persians only care to eat and drink. They made jokes about

Americans and said, 'We are first Persians, we will never be Americans. We go by the rules of Persia.' They believe that women are only to bear children and to be beaten. They said I should learn their language.

"I tell my husband that he is ignorant because he cannot read English. He refuses to attend a night school. I tell him, 'Your people are no good—they are not citizens or voters. I am a voter.'

"He gets sore when I laugh at their prayers, the food which they prepare, and their queer ideas. They are the most backward race of the universe. Several times I have told his Persian friends to leave my house. These times he beat me, saying, 'I'll show you to shame them like that.'

"My husband does not like the food I like. He does not like dessert, fish, butter, bread, or vegetables. He prefers large quantities of highly seasoned meat. I prefer fish and vegetables.

"I have read a great deal about the Persians. They only live to drink and eat. They do not believe in sports of any kind.

"My husband's mother is living in Persia. He is the only son. He hasn't seen his mother since he was nine years old, when he went with his father to Russia to learn the painting trade. He has received letters from his mother. She calls him her only beloved son. He tells me that he is suspicious of all women and that he wouldn't even trust his mother.

"My husband is so stubborn. I have tried to get him to go to night school, but he will not go. The other day he let the car freeze up because I asked him to drain the water out of it. When he was out of work, I asked him to take his car and get a job throwing circulars. He said to me, 'What, do you expect me to get up so early in the morning? In Persia men don't work.'

"I have had one miscarriage. I was anxious to have a baby as I was getting along in years, and I thought, 'What is having a baby?' But when the baby came, he wouldn't do anything to help me. I had to wash the diapers and do the shopping. Persian men don't work.

"I enjoy having sexual relations with my husband. I need a strong man, and he is like a brute. In that way we are better suited than I was with my first husband. I would like another baby if he would

be good to me. I am not withholding because I do not like him that way, but because I do not want to have a baby while things are so bad.

"Sometimes I hate my husband. Last night I was sitting thinking, and I thought that if a policeman would come and tell me that my husband was killed, I would feel relieved. He would never want to divorce me because the Persians don't believe in divorce. As long as he is alive, I would rather be with him. As long as people know he is alive, they will ask, 'Where is your husband?' If he would be dead, people would say, 'You *had* a husband.'

"He is always threatening to take away the child. He curses me and the baby calls me the same things."

In understanding Mrs. U.'s attitudes in the foregoing case, one must take into account the superimposition of American culture upon the Jewish culture. Mrs. U.'s view of marriage in its more practical aspects is in keeping with the culture of her Jewish group, although she also possesses a romantic ideal gleaned from her American contacts. Her husband's culture is fundamentally foreign and, according to the wife's point of view, an inferior culture. In so far as there are any American elements in it, conflict with the wife does not occur at these points.

The husband, because he belongs to the Persian group, is thought to have all the traits of this group. It is in this way that much of the antagonism of the wife is directed toward cultural differences of the Persian group, with which the husband has become identified in the mind of his wife. Some of these traits the husband actually shares with others of the Persian group; others are assigned to him as a part of the stereotype. This superimposition of traits, however, aggravates the conflict by providing a ready fund of rationalizations to justify the wife's attitudes toward her husband.

While conflict may arise out of cultural differences existing at the time of marriage, even greater conflict may develop following the development of divergent folkways and mores subsequent to marriage. This is strikingly portrayed in cases

of separation of husband and wife over some period of time through emigration of one or the other, usually the husband, to America. In some instances the husband leaves for America soon after marriage, while in other instances there are already several children. He promises to send for his family as soon as he is well established in the new country.

In America the immigrant affects superficial changes almost immediately in regard to dress, manners, religion, and gradually with respect to language, standards of conduct, etc., in order that he may not long remain a "greenhorn." In spite of the fact that he usually continues to live within an immigrant community, he finds that many of his "landsmen" have been in the country much longer than he has and, therefore, in many respects their culture is quite different from his own. If he is young and ambitious, he will attend night school to speed up the process of Americanization. While his employment may at first be within the immigrant community, later he may find work outside, where others than those of his own group are employed. If he is Jewish, he soon learns that he must work on Saturday and that observance of the piety he knew in Europe is in conflict with the practical needs in the new country. Soon he finds himself attending "shul" only on holidays. At times he may appear discouraged, particularly if in Europe he has been a learned man, for in his new community he may find that he must accept work of lower social status. Here it makes little difference what he has been in the past. He may find it more difficult to get ahead financially than he has anticipated. Year after year he postpones sending for his wife or family. In some instances the postponement has been obligatory because of the World War or restricted immigration. The husband, believing that he will never be able to have his wife join him, may enter into a relationship with some woman acquaintance—his landlady, for example. Or, the social control known in his immigrant community having been removed, he engages in extra-marital relations with prostitutes.

In many situations, it is true, the husband is sincere in wanting his family to join him. Both husband and wife may

have looked forward for a long time to the reunion only to be wholly disappointed when it actually takes place. The disillusionment is usually expressed in this way by the husband, "She seemed like a stranger to me." The wife, too, is disappointed. This mutual disillusionment is due to the fact that their dress, general appearance and mannerisms are different from what they both anticipated after the long separation. Almost at first sight a barrier between them seems to arise in their relations with each other.

When Mr. and Mrs. W. were living together in Europe, Mr. W. was a very good husband. He went to shul and would pray twice a day. Now Mrs. W. complains that her husband would not think of doing this. In America "he does not believe in God, but only in himself." Mrs. W. lived in Europe for nine years by herself while her husband was in this country. During this time she did housework, worked on farms, and in German hospitals during the war. She was anxious to join her husband in America, for she thought that then all her troubles would be ended. She would be in the rich country—America. Mr. W. had left for America a week after his baby was born. When he sent for his wife later, she could not come because of the war. He was drafted into the American army and served nine months in the trenches in France. At the close of the war he was able to send for his wife and child.

Mr. W., who had been a machinist in Europe, became in America first a fruit peddler, then a chairmaker, owner of a shoe store, and finally a cabdriver.

Mr. W. in discussing the situation said, "I borrowed every cent I could to get my wife here. I had just started to work as a cabdriver and the morning she came I went to the train to meet her in my new cab. Her brother was there to meet her too. I can't tell you how I felt! She looked so different. I looked at my child. He seemed so cold, so skinny, and ugly. He treated me like a stranger. My wife did not kiss me. When we arrived home she said, 'Where are some of my landsmen and friends? Is there no one here?' I told her I thought she would want to be alone with me the first evening she was here. She seemed so strange. . . . We had trouble from the start. She showed no desire to live with me. . . . I spent all the money I could raise in order to buy the cab and bring her here. I did not have much left for furniture. She said, 'I make you buy new furniture.

In America women don't use old furniture. Buy me new dresses. Other women from my town—their husbands buy them new dresses in America. You have lived like a prince. Look at you.' . . . I wanted her to go to English classes. She said, 'What, you make me out a greenhorn.' . . . I had no influence with the boy either. He stayed with the mother and was strange to me. . . . Two months after she came I left her."

This strangeness between wife and husband and between children and father is not uncommon. In some situations, in fact, it has furnished the basis for an incestuous relationship between father and daughter. This is made possible by the fact that long separation has completely broken down the attitudes which normally characterize parent-child relations.

In other cases the differentiation is so complete as to produce a high degree of personal disorganization in the newcomer. This situation is portrayed in the I. case in which the wife finds her husband quite as strange as the new world to which she has come, and yet she is expected to have intimate contacts with him. The result is that her home, which ordinarily would provide some stabilization in her new environment, only adds to the confusion in which she finds herself.

Mr. I., before his emigration to America, lived in a Jewish-Polish community on the outskirts of Warsaw. Most of this community belonged to the sect of "Chasidim." This sect has its fixed customs and ideas. In their piety there is a great deal of poetry, song legends, and superstition. All of their worries are relieved by a rabbi who can perform miracles. Before Mr. I. left his home town he always observed all the religious rites of the community. He dressed in Polish-Jewish style, wearing earlocks and a long "caftan." Both Mr. and Mrs. I. were extremely religious, keeping up all the observances of olden times. They observed all the dietary laws.

Mr. I. came to America to escape military service soon after the birth of his second child, the first then being three years old. Because of the restriction on immigration he was not able to send for his family for seven years. During this time Mr. I. sent his wife \$40.00 a month and in addition she conducted a small business. For a time Mr. I. adjusted quite well economically. However, when he accumulated property which was heavily mortgaged it was necessary to put the

larger part of his earnings into the payments. It was only with the greatest economy that he was able to manage. After seven years Mr. I. sent for his family to join him.

"I have been here a little over a year," Mrs. I said. "I came to Ellis Island and some friends in Brooklyn telegraphed my husband. When he came to the station in Chicago to meet me, he passed me four times and did not recognize me. . . . He took me where he had been rooming with his friends. It was too crowded there. We took a flat of six rooms in his building, which was vacant. We bought the necessary furniture and took roomers. Then we moved with his friends again. I can't understand them. I had friends in Poland, but I have no one here. Six months after I came to this country, I started feeling bad. I couldn't eat very well. I tried to force myself to eat. I was short of breath. I did all the work in the house.

"In Europe, every time the children came to me I told them, 'Your father is in America. Sometime you are going to know him. Your father will have fine things for us.' Now he doesn't pay attention to the children. I am disappointed. He does not take me out, and this [pointing to her coat] is all I have. My hands shake. I have a dizzy feeling. I have a breaking out on my face. I feel weary. The landlady told my husband I should use separate towels. I started feeling bad when I began to feel that I didn't have so much furniture and clothes and when he didn't seem to care for the children. I didn't say anything. I kept it all in me. I am afraid my husband is going to leave me. He told me I could go back to Poland if I wanted to. I was sitting by my window watching my children play with the neighbor children. My children were wearing the small prayer shawls which boys of school age wore in Poland. I saw the other boys pulling at them and laughing. I am afraid for my children!"

"I have been married to my wife for thirteen years," said Mr. I. "Seven of these years we have been apart. When I married her she felt good. She was a healthy girl and a smart girl. Her uncle, who raised her, gave me \$1,000.00 dowry. I liked the girl. . . . When we were first married she refused to stay with me the first night. It is the Jewish law that man and wife stay together the first night if the wife has purified herself in a 'mickvo.' She acted like a baby. . . . For five or six months after the first child was born she didn't let me touch her. She wasn't in the water [i.e., purified in a 'mickvo'] for six months. She said, 'I have a boy—that is enough.' I didn't like it but I didn't touch her. We had separate beds—that is the Jewish law.

"When she came here she was the same way as when we were first married—maybe worse. She told me, 'I am afraid. Don't touch me.' I told her, 'How can you talk like that? You are not a baby. Now you are the mother of two children. Now you are in America.' . . . She acts like a kid. She is afraid of everything. She is afraid I will go away and not come back. She is jealous. She wants me with her all the time. She says I have other women and that I will go away from her. She tells me that she is a greenhorn and that I must have another woman.

"I told her that we must not have any more children—that we must save for our property. I was given birth-control advice by a friend. She objected. She does not understand. Now she thinks I have been with other women. I asked her to attend an English class so that she will learn the language. She thinks this means that I am ashamed of her. I am not ashamed of her. I know she is a very smart woman, but I want her to know everything in America.

"I would like to have brought her here sooner but I had to wait to be a citizen here. She was living with her sister there. I always told people that I had a wife and children in Europe. I never pretended that I was a single man. But I wouldn't have brought her here if I thought she was going to be sick and act this way. I want a wife. She figures it is all my fault. She thinks I am a rich man, and I keep things from her. She thought that when she came to America she would find a generous husband who would give her fine things. She does not understand that if I don't pay on my property I will have nothing. I can't buy her whatever she wants for herself and the children. She says to me, 'Don't you believe in God? Do you ride on street cars and in automobiles on Saturday?'¹

"I took my wife to a couple of shows. She would like to go all the time. I haven't the time. I don't get home until 7 P. M. from work. I can't be with her all the time. She is jealous of me all the time. She likes business better than housework. For two years my mother lived with us in Europe. She did the home work and my wife worked in the grocery. She liked that better. She is smart for business. I like the children but I don't show it, so she thinks I don't care for them."

The mental confusion on the part of the wife in the foregoing case, is that resulting from change in environment where

¹I.e., the orthodox Jewish Sabbath.

objects have lost their old meanings and have not yet taken on new meanings. The normal confusion which characterizes movement from one country to another is exaggerated, however, by the pronounced differences in cultural adjustments of the husband and wife. Upon arrival Mrs. I. finds quite a different husband from the one she has idealized in Europe. Mr. I. had written her that he was buying property and with the tales that circulate in Poland about America, she expected to find him a rich man. Instead, she came to a poor man. When he left her in Poland, he had dressed and acted differently. Here she finds him unable to observe the religious customs which she expected of him.

The husband's horizon during his seven years alone in America had narrowed. He had habituated himself to the routine of sending his wife a fixed sum regularly. He was comfortable in the home of friends. His dominant interest was that of saving by careful financing in order to accumulate some property. He is not content that the arrival of his family should interfere with this ambition. He expects his wife to live economically and to aid with the finances. To the wife, however, this attitude is confusing and inconsistent with the legendary tales of America.

With the husband's abandonment of many of the religious customs he had observed in Europe, came a different attitude toward marriage. Where formerly his sex life, for example, had been regulated by religious taboos and laws, he has assimilated the American outlook which recognizes no social controls but leaves the matter wholly up to the individual. To Mrs. I. who "loved first God and then her husband" this newer outlook is not only incomprehensible but sacrilegious.

The indifference of Mr. I. toward his children, Mrs. I. interprets as indifference to herself. She feels neglected by her husband in every way. The only explanation she can give is that he must have another woman—one who can speak English and who is devoid of all the traits which in the immigrant group mark one as a "greenhorn." She lives in constant fear that her husband may desert her.

In an effort to strengthen her position as a wife and gain response from her husband she endeavors to attract attention and to control the situation through exaggerated complaints of illness.

Cultural conflict developed owing to the long separation of husband and wife during which Mr. I. became Americanized. Quite as severe conflict, however, not infrequently develops in the immigrant group, without this separation. In these cases the differentiation of cultural traits grows out of differences in the rates at which the two individuals adjust to life in America. Through the wider contacts of the husband he often becomes Americanized much more rapidly than his wife. This is particularly true where the wife takes no part in the activities of earning a living. Not infrequently she becomes jealous of all her husband's contacts, which symbolize his Americanization. As a result she endeavors to limit his activities outside the home until he feels that all his rights are infringed upon. Accordingly the husband often feels justified in ignoring his obligations to his wife and family.

Thus whether cultural differences are present at the time of marriage or arise subsequently, due either to separation growing out of emigration or to differentials in the process of Americanization, conflict grows out of the presence of cultural elements in the behavior of one individual which call out strong aversions and prejudices in the other. The importance of such conflict, accordingly, is dependent upon the strength of these aversions and prejudices and the extent to which adjustment in other realms tends to overshadow the lack of cultural harmony. The more severe conflicts tend to be found, therefore, in those cases where these cultural differences have become a basic element in personality because associated with the ethical and moral standards of the individual.

Whenever cultural elements become associated with ethical and moral standards, they tend no longer to provide simply a basis for the habitual responses of the individual, but to become incorporated into a philosophy of life which furnishes a unifying and stabilizing element in the life activities of

the individual. In addition to its functioning as a directive agency, the philosophy of life also provides the individual with a fund of rationalizations. These rationalizations protect the personality from recognizing inconsistencies in its conduct and furnish ready formulas for meeting the criticism of others.

Conflict between husband and wife tends to arise inevitably where there is too great a difference in philosophies of life. These differences may exist at the time of marriage but be suppressed in the interest of the romantic situation. What probably more commonly happens, however, is a differentiation of philosophies of life which grows out of differences in group contacts.

"I was living with my sister when I met Mr. Q.," explained Mrs. Q. "He was living next door at the home of a minister. The minister thought he was a good man and encouraged me to marry him. My sister didn't like him and told me not to marry him. He came from Odessa and my sister said that Odessa people like to drink. Then, too, he came every day in a different suit, and my sister said that a man who has so many suits will let his wife go without dresses. I told my sister I would marry who I wanted to. That was the way she did. He took me to parties and shows. He was fine looking and I liked him. I was seventeen and he was twenty-one. He was a cap maker at that time. I was working, too. I came from work tired. I thought, 'I have no home. After my mother died—no good days.' I hoped I could have a good home, that I shouldn't suffer, and maybe there would be good days for me. I married him, my sister telling me that I would be sorry. . . . Soon after we were married it was hard to get work. He said he was coming to Chicago, as he had relatives here who were making a nice living. He wanted to come here himself and then send for me. That was seven or eight months after we were married. My sister told me, 'You let him go, he'll leave you,' so I made him bring me. He soon found work. . . .

"Then we began to have trouble. He always had his women. . . . My husband doesn't like what I like. He is so different from me. He plays cards and likes to go to shows. He looks like a prince. He is more of a sport. I like to sew and to fix things. I like a home. I am satisfied to stay in it. I stayed home and let him go alone. . . . Whenever he had a dollar, he spent it for clothes. He would make the rent wait and buy himself a new suit. He paid \$5.00 and \$6.00 for silk shirts. He dressed for the girls. Women like him, but if he is good enough for another woman, he is good enough for me.

"I have no friends except my neighbors. His friends are different. . . . He makes a better appearance than I do. He is smarter than I am. It is a disgrace for a woman not to have her husband. People talk about it and ask questions. If he would be dead, it would be different. People wouldn't ask. So as long as I have a husband, I would rather he would be at home. The children like him. I have always been so crazy about him. I used to stand in the cold on the street watching for him, just to be able to look at him. . . .

"Good days are not for me. Nothing can make me happy again. I am not sorry that I haven't much money, but I am sorry that I have no husband to stick with me and talk with me. That is my idea of a husband. Not a man who is a sport and thinks only of himself and other women. If a person has no money, they will get along some way, but if you haven't a good husband, there is no way out."

"I knew my wife five months before I married her," said Mr. Q. "I liked her. I made good money after we were married, but it never seemed to satisfy her. She showed no interest in anything. Her only need for a man was to make a living for her. My job was to feed her. We argued about everything. My wife never wanted to go anywhere with me. She thought she was better than my relatives or any of my friends. Anyway my friends didn't care for her. . . . My wife was a nice, good, respectable girl when I married her. I can't deny that. She is a good mother to the children. But aside from that she is a chain around my neck. She is just like she was when I married her. For seven years she never went out of the house with me. She sat at home and wanted me to do the same thing. The only place she ever went was to the neighbors. She never tried to advance herself. Things will never change. My wife will never be different. She tries to force me to be a different person. I married her—now I have to pay for it. We should have separated after the first child was born, but she told me, 'You have to stick with me for better or worse.' I am a man who knows how to use his own head. Other people give my wife advice and she follows it. I don't take anyone's advice. I do things for myself."

Thus the conflict between Mr. and Mrs. Q. develops out of radical differences in outlook upon life. Mrs. Q. is more interested in her home. Her contacts are primary—mostly with neighbors. In contrast Mr. Q. is more interested in secondary contacts where personal appearance and good clothes give him "front." His conception of his role in marriage is that of a

"free-lance," while Mrs. Q. desires a "conventional" husband. Much of this difference in outlook can be accounted for by the more limited contacts of the wife as over against those of the husband.

Cultural conflict, however, has often been unduly emphasized in the explanation of domestic discord since not infrequently cultural differences provide a ready basis for rationalizing more fundamental conflicts. Even in those cases where cultural differences seem basic to the conflict, as in those already presented, it is not improbable that had there been greater identification in response relations much of the cultural conflict would have been repressed.

This relative unimportance of cultural differences in domestic discord is understandable when one realizes the extent to which individuals feel the need of readily verbalized elements to furnish not only to their friends but to themselves as well a plausible explanation for tension and friction which is largely emotional in form. Cultural differences, being more readily recognized and expressed in language, provide thus a fund of explanatory elements for conflicts which grow out of more elemental demands for affection, sympathy, appreciation of aspirations and ideals.

The utilization of cultural differences as a basis for rationalization is to be seen particularly in the case of the N.'s. Here what seems to be cultural conflict is in reality a rationalization of economic and response conflicts. So strongly does the wife resent the lack of affection and attention from her husband that she sees even in his interest in the radio an attempt to satisfy a desire for contacts with other women.

"I married my husband sixteen years ago," said Mrs. N. "I had known him for two years in Europe. After he was in this country for about a year, he sent for me. . . . When I came I went to work in order to buy some new clothes, as I did not want to be a 'green-horn.' I bought a silk dress, new shoes, and fixed up like they did in this country. Then I married Mr. N. . . . We seemed never to get along. At the time that my first baby was born and I was in the hospital, my husband did not come to see me until a couple days later,

after the baby was born. On visiting days he came, but did not bring me anything. The other women's husbands all brought them something.

"My husband seemed to always want to save. He is like that. There are things about him that I can't stand; that is, when he takes a bath, he never uses soap, although I have all sorts of soap in the bathroom. I never feel that he is clean. His haircut bothers me. He has his hair cut like a Russian soldier, a little hair on the top and none on the sides. I tried to persuade him to get a different kind of a haircut. He insists upon going to Sears Roebuck for a haircut because it costs ten cents less. Sometimes I feel ashamed to go out with him. He has three suits hanging in the closet but always wears the worst one he can find. His shoes are always run over. He is just a common man and comes from a common family. His father was a butcher and his brother is a butcher. . . .

"We quarrel about the location of the furniture. I want the furniture one way and he wants it the other. He tells me how to keep my pantry. He wants it a certain way. One time he locked up the sewing machine, saying that he didn't want me to use it as I might break it. My husband spends all his extra time thinking about radios. He buys all sorts of books paying fifty cents and one dollar for them, saying he wants to learn about radios. He lets ours play continually. I get tired to death of it. Sometimes he leaves it on when there is nothing to it at all. I have noticed that if it happens to be a woman who is performing he enjoys it whether it is good or not.

"Sometimes I think he really cares for me, yet he pays so little attention to me. I know he must make more money than he says. I think he has it all fixed with his employer. I think he spends it on other women."

"I knew my wife in Europe when she was about sixteen years old," related Mr. N. "I worked for her brother-in-law. I decided to come to America. . . . I promised her that when I got to America and saved the money I would send for her. . . .

"Nine months later I sent for my girl. When she came I gave her \$25.00 and told her to buy some clothes. She bought a dress but did not buy the right kind. I told her to buy a plain dress, but instead she bought a silk dress. Right away she started going her own way rather than my way. She worked a short time; then we were married. The first few years we got along fairly well, but things seemed

to pile up; little things at first, but from little things came big troubles.

"I have been disappointed here because I seem never to have had anyone to talk to. In Europe I belonged to a society of radicals. There I met educated people. I was not interested in the party, but the people. There is a Radio Society that I would like to belong to. It costs \$5.00 a month to be a member. I didn't even know I had received a letter until I found it in the wet wash. My wife had put it there because she didn't want me to find it. I have always liked to read. In Europe I used to read day and night. There I was nicknamed the 'Philosopher.' When I was only fifteen years old, I knew the Bible was wrong. One time, not very long ago, I bought a Bible—a New Testament. I was not interested in the religion—that is foolish. Scientists think that way, too. How can anyone say that God is in the sky? I bought a book just because I was curious. I just wanted to read it. My wife found the Bible and tore it up. . . . For a long time I have been interested in electricity. I have always wanted to be an electrician. One time I was going to take a course. My wife made such a fuss that I didn't get to do it. Now I am interested in the radio. I changed my radio from a six-tube to a nine-tube. I took out the batteries and made it run by electricity.

"It just seems we are not interested in the same things. I never ride on the street car that I don't wonder, 'How does the car run? There is only one wire.' Then I think of such things as: 'Why is it that a bird can stand on an electrical wire and never get killed? Why is there a rubber pad under the electric chair?' I am always wanting to know the reason for things. My wife laughs at me. I can't talk about these things to her. She doesn't understand. She calls me a dumbbell. I like to read electrical books, but she finds them and throws them away. I bought some electrical books from a mail order house for ten cents. They were old books and were reduced from \$3.50. My wife accused me of paying this amount for them. I had to go and get my receipt for ten cents in order to show her that I told the truth. She complains that I spend too much on the radio. I do all my buying wholesale. I like to fix things around the house. I made a switch and later found out that the Brunswick Company had made and were selling the same switch. Mine worked just as well as theirs. I spend from an hour to two hours every night at home fixing things. My wife says I am just fooling around. Whenever I go to my father's house, he asks me to put in some wires, fix the switches, etc. My wife always objects to that, but still doesn't want me to do anything at home. I changed the desk lamp into a

piano lamp. After I got it fixed, she wouldn't let me use it. . . . If I knew more about electricity I wouldn't be working in a shoe factory. I am tired of working there. For seventeen years I have been working there. During the war I made as much as \$60.00 a week. During season I average \$40.00 to \$45.00 per week. I have no interest there. I can't talk to the people I work with. . . .

"Several times we have started to a show together, but have quarrelled before we got there. Once I gave up my seat to a woman who was standing. My wife said that I did so because I was interested in women, and that I should let them stand. I insisted that I would do the same thing to an older man. If I go to a show and applaud a number that my wife is not interested in, she tells me that I am only doing it because a woman happens to be performing. She tells me that I only play the radio in order to hear women's voices. Several times I have bought her presents of silk stockings and bloomers. She objects to this because she says I simply buy these things in order to visit with women clerks. She says that such things are only for goys¹ and Polacks. Then we get into a quarrel. I ask her what is wrong with a Polack.² I feel that the Negro is the same man as I am! . . .

"My wife has such funny ideas. For instance, she used to always sign her name on everything; Mrs. *Ruth* N. I told her that she should use my name and sign things, Mrs. *Sol* N. She would never do this and mixed up my policy and things. Then when she went to visit her sister and found that she is using her husband's name, she started using my name, but she never believed me. . . .

"I still care for my wife and would like to be happy with her. I think she still cares for me. I never have thought of leaving her. The other night I was looking over the map of the United States because I am interested in geography. She started crying, telling me that I must be thinking of leaving her."

Mrs. N. is jealous of all her husband's interests—his reading, absorption in electricity, the radio, etc., because they take from her the attention which she craves. She justifies her own lack of interests which she is unable to identify with those of her husband, however, by lowering his status whenever possible. She calls many of his hobbies "foolery," and through cultural

¹A non-Jew

²A person of Polish birth.

recriminations of various sorts represents him as an inferior individual. The response tension is also reflected in the economic conflict and indicates Mrs. N.'s fear that her husband may be making more than his pay envelopes show, in which case he must be spending the money on other women. These divergent interests, therefore, get their meaning out of the fact that they symbolize lack of sympathy and identification.

It is in this way, accordingly, that cultural conflict serves as the basis for rationalization of more fundamental factors in the domestic-discord situation, particularly response conflict. This process by which cultural conflict becomes symbolic of conflict in other phases of the relationship is in its broader aspects, however, a part of the larger problem of the linkage between factors in conflict situations. While the general character of this linkage has already been suggested, its significance becomes more clearly defined when the processes of analysis preparatory to treatment are understood.

•

PART FOUR

THE TREATMENT OF DOMESTIC DISCORD

CHAPTER XII

ANALYSIS AND TREATMENT

In the foregoing chapters, analysis of domestic discord has been in terms of the classification of general patterns. The function of analysis, accordingly, was to arrive at an understanding of the various types of domestic discord. From the standpoint of treatment, however, the problem of analysis is somewhat different. Here the problem is first to relate each factor within a particular case with every other factor, so as to make clear the process or pattern as a whole. Thus the function of the analytical process is to discover the elements in the situation which produce domestic discord and toward which treatment will subsequently be directed.

Analysis from this point of view is obviously a dynamic process within the interview. The assumption at the beginning of the interview is that there is some fundamental pattern to be had, and the interview is, therefore, guided in that direction.¹ As the interview progresses, the interviewer not only develops hunches as to the problem, but he is able to test out these hunches or hypotheses. The test lies in the consistency of the data he is able to obtain and upon which he must base both his analysis and treatment. The consistency of the analysis in part, therefore, as well as the effectiveness of treatment, is dependent upon the ability of the interviewer to get at these fundamental patterns.

It is apparent, then, that the function of analysis in this dynamic sense is to get at the fundamental pattern in a particular case as an essential part of the treatment process. This function is, as has already been intimated, basically related to

¹See Chapter II.

certain assumptions underlying the analytical approach of which the more important are: (1) the process conception of domestic discord, and (2) the role of symbolization in domestic discord.

That the attitudes and events leading to domestic discord form a process or sequence has previously been recognized.¹ However, these sequences have been thought to start with the conflict situation (and therefore within the marriage situation), because of failure to recognize the backgrounds of the persons concerned; whereas much conflict in marriage, as has been shown, has its genesis in the early life of the individual. Where disorganization of personality has been found, the same mechanisms were seen functioning in domestic discord. Even in those cases where domestic discord may be thought of as arising out of the marriage situation, this experience cannot be segregated from the rest of the life of the individual. His attitudes toward marriage in all its phases, for example, grow out of his earlier experiences.

In order to understand the process of domestic discord, therefore, it is necessary to understand the sequence of events in the life process of the individual or individuals which culminate in the domestic discord situation. This is true not only from the standpoint of analysis but also from the point of view of treatment. In cases of personality disorganization the domestic discord cannot be treated satisfactorily in abstraction from the rest of the disorganized personality, since the domestic conflict constitutes only a part of the general conflict pattern.

Even in cases where personality disorganization does not exist, it is equally important to understand the background of the individuals concerned. Treatment involves primarily the changing of attitudes. It is obvious that one cannot change attitudes without an understanding of their genesis, and this invariably takes one back into the early life of the individual. Furthermore, as will be developed more fully in the following chapter, since showing the individual the relationship between

¹See E. R. Mowrer, *Family Disorganization*, pp. 216-229.

various phases of his life processes constitutes one of the essentials of the "Insight" type of treatment, this cannot be done without a similar excursion into early backgrounds.

The sequence conception, however, does not necessarily imply a straight-line progression. In fact, perhaps the most significant aspect of sequences in domestic-discord cases is the circular nature by which one element passes over into another, which in turn directly or indirectly modifies or aggravates the first element. For example, as is so often seen in the escape-response type, a girl either actually the youngest of the family or having the role of the youngest, pampered in her family group, early gets the idea that this is the role to be desired. She may work out her own technique of retaining this role in her contacts outside her family. On the other hand, she may find that she is unable to carry over her important role, and she therefore feels misunderstood. Work may prove a failure to her, and in order to escape it she marries.

Having had no knowledge of sex, shock and revulsion toward sexual intercourse occur early in the marriage relationship. She feels hurt and misunderstood in marriage relations as she had previously in communal relations. Unable to play the "pampered child" role, she develops escape mechanisms and schemes for securing attention through complaints of ill health. Thus sex conflict soon develops into a health conflict. The husband may express his dissatisfaction at the fact that his wife is "too ill" to engage in marital relations, and later, when he feels that her complaints are exaggerated, he may seek sexual satisfaction elsewhere. Thus the health conflict may be said to aggravate in turn the first element—that of sex conflict. The wife, cognizant of the growing sex tension and the fact that her husband no longer approaches her, interprets these factors as indicating indifference and lack of sympathy and understanding on his part. Thus sex conflict soon spreads to the response realm. The result is that husband and wife no longer go out together, the wife complaining that she is not well enough to go out with her husband. If he goes alone, he may decide that after all, he no longer has much

in common with his wife. The wife believes that her husband's going out alone indicates his lack of sympathy.

Following the breakdown of sympathetic understanding, symbolized in the husband's going out alone, both may decide that they never had a great deal in common, that one or the other was always the superior. This superiority is proved by pointing to the superior family status of one as over against the other. Response conflict is thus seen passing over into cultural conflict, the cultural element in turn aggravating the response element. The husband, feeling so little identification with his family, may accordingly feel justified in not being overindulgent as far as financial matters are concerned; or, having made other alliances, he may for the time being feel rather hard-pressed financially. Thus the circle continues with the appearance of economic conflict which again may aggravate the health conflict, the wife demanding money for innumerable doctor bills. This progressive circular relation continues, accordingly, until finally the breaking point is reached in the marriage relations of the two individuals.

Because of this circular nature of domestic-discord factors, treatment is, in many instances, not as difficult as one might anticipate. While it is true that conflict in one phase of relations tends to spread to other phases, adjustment of one factor likewise tends to influence the other factors. For example, in the situation just cited, adjustment of the sex conflict in turn influences the wife's attitude toward her life process as a whole, which in turn is important in the adjustment of the sex conflict. Likewise, modification of these conflicts influence the health conflict which in turn modifies the response conflict. Cultural and economic conflict tends to disappear in the face of greater harmony in the sex and response realm. While the writer does not mean to infer that adjustment of such complex situations is as simple as the above analysis might indicate, this is essentially the nature of the process by which adjustment is accomplished. Thus modification of one element tends in turn to modify other elements so as to produce a cumulative result through the circular linkage between factors.

While each factor in the domestic-discord situation may be thought of as being related in general to every other factor, what is probably of greater significance is the peculiar way in which these elements often become symbolized in other phases of the relationship.¹ Unfortunately what are generally recognized as sequences consist of overt behavior. To recognize such sequences is of little significance unless one understands the covert phases of the conflict which they symbolize. Economic conflict, for example, is many times symbolic of sex conflict, no other trace of which appears on the surface. In such situations the husband withholds support after repeated refusals of sexual relations on the part of the wife. The implication here is that the wife does not deserve support if she is not a "wife," a position supported by both the law and the mores.

Similarly, what appears overtly as cultural conflict is, in many instances, response conflict. In these instances one of the marriage partners, unable to explain the lack of understanding or identification of interests on the part of the other, hits upon what seems to him to be a logical explanation—"I came from a different type of family," or "I am an American, he is foreign."

Again, what appears to be an unreasonable dislike of a wife for her husband's family may be only an indication of a serious response conflict. Or a sex conflict may express itself overtly in an intense hatred of one parent for a particular child. Likewise, what appears as ill health or drunkenness may be fundamentally a particular personality conflict aggravated by a sexual conflict, response conflict, or what not. In fact, there are almost unlimited ways in which covert phases of conflict express themselves overtly, all of which are of significance from the standpoint of analysis and treatment.

From the standpoint of the interviewing technique this symbolic nature of conflict elements is of fundamental importance since the discovery of one aspect leads to the inference that the other is present and serves as a cue to further questioning. The ability to use "prediction" in asking questions, also, grows out

¹Compare pp. 162-168 and pp. 172-189 on symbolic nature of sex conflict and of response conflict.

of the recognition of the symbolical meaning of many of the factors or terms.

The social therapist, however, may be, and often is, misled by overt factors. This may be due to the fact that overt factors present what appears to many to be a logical sequence.¹ It seems unnecessary, therefore, to go beyond these surface manifestations. Again, many untrained analysts and therapists are likely to think of causation in more simple terms than is justifiable, and in their zest for arriving at some solution of the particular problem they are likely to view it only in its less complex aspects, neglecting the more fundamental factors.

Furthermore, it is much more difficult to get at covert processes. The individual experiencing the domestic discord usually describes his conflict in overt terms and in the absence of a highly skilled interviewing technique covert phases are left untouched. Many an interviewer has been known to remark, "I asked the husband if he was experiencing personal conflict," or "I asked the wife if she thought sex was causing any of the difficulty with her husband and she answered, 'No.' " Here, of course, the interviewer assumes that the person himself knows what is causing the difficulty and understands the motivations back of his behavior and that of his marriage partner. Obviously, if he understood these things he would not need an expert's help. It is difficult also for the analyst to interpret much of the overt behavior in terms of its symbolic significance unless he has had considerable training and experience, as so often is not the case.

If the social therapist is misled by overt factors, the fundamental elements in the situation remain untouched. For example, in many instances only the economic situation is treated, which, as has already been pointed out, may be symbolic of a sex conflict. Futile efforts to persuade a husband to support his wife or family by pointing out his moral duty to do so or

¹In the sequence described on pp. 217-218, for example, what would often be thought of as constituting the sequence would be perhaps health conflict, followed by economic and cultural conflict. This leaves out of account the early life pattern of the individual and, therefore, the basis of his illness as well as the covert processes of sex and response conflict symbolized in economic and cultural conflict.

through resorts to force by endeavoring to compel him through legal action are many times indications of this lack of understanding of the more fundamental aspects of the situation. Efforts at understanding and treating these covert processes undoubtedly would prove more fruitful. Or take, for example, a situation which so often concerns the social therapist, viz., that of conflict of one of the marriage partners with the other's family. Here the situation is frequently treated by advising the married couple to move a greater distance from the offending family. No recognition is made of the symbolic significance of the conflict factors involved. It is felt that by removal of the family the conflict element will magically disappear. That the real significance may be the symbolization of a response conflict which in turn may involve a sex conflict or a type of unadjusted life pattern—in short, a highly complex situation involving an entirely different type of treatment—is overlooked.

Likewise, certain crisis situations can be treated more intelligently if their real significance is understood. Take desertion for example. It is one thing to know that in a particular instance it symbolizes the wish of the husband or wife to end his or her marital state; that in another instance it may mean simply an attempt to escape from a difficult situation, other escape mechanisms having been used by the same individual in the past. Or again it may simply symbolize a threat—"If you don't treat me better I will go through with this someday." Yet in other instances it may indicate a desire for attention. It is through recognition of these symbolical meanings, therefore, that such a crisis situation can be adequately met, thereby preventing rather than fostering its constant recurrence.

The analytical problem presented to the social therapist in a particular case, therefore, is to get below the level of overt behavior and to discover the fundamental elements and patterns. How this is done may be seen in the V. case:

Mr. V. came to America at the age of fourteen. By saving for two years, he was able to accumulate the sum of \$20.00, which he sent to his father's sister in New York. With this amount and some addi-

tional, a ticket was obtained for him to come to America. After Mr. V.'s arrival, he worked to repay the amount of his indebtedness.

Mrs. V. came to America from Europe at the age of fourteen. Only part of her family (mother and two brothers) accompanied her, the father and one brother coming later. One brother, who remained, died of typhus fever.

FAMILY ORGANIZATION

Mr. V. was the youngest of a family of seven children—four boys and three girls. The mother died from childbirth when Mr. V. was two years old. Soon afterwards the father remarried. The stepmother did not like the stepchildren, and Mr. V. went to live with an uncle at the age of five years. At the age of seven he went to work, continuing to live with his uncle. He speaks of his early life as being very unhappy. He shows little attachment for his family. He says, "They were always poor and no one paid any attention to me. I never knew what it was to have a happy day."

Mr. V.'s oldest brother is living near him and is friendly with him. A sister and two brothers are still in Europe, but Mr. V. does not hear from them.

Mrs. V. was the third oldest of a family of seven children—four boys and three girls. Five other children died in infancy. At one time the father was moderately well-to-do, having owned a kerosene factory. Later there was an explosion, and the father was burned so badly that it was necessary for him to spend two years in bed. Mrs. V. says that her father was not a good business man, the factory having been bought for him by his father, who held a mortgage on it. The mother was a good business woman and blamed the father for his lack of business ability. The family later lost everything, the mother even having to sell her jewelry.

Mrs. V. says that her family experienced only hardship as far back as she can remember, her mother telling her of their more prosperous periods.

Mrs. V. was reared by an aunt from the time she was four years old, growing up practically as an only child. She was given more advantages than her parents could have given her. She was fond of her aunt and uncle, but longed to see her parents and brothers and sisters more often.

After her uncle's death and the remarriage of her aunt, Mrs. V. came with her family to America. She says that she was so pleased to be with her own family that she was the happiest girl in the world. "I was considered like a baby by my sisters, for I was the youngest of them; and then they made more over me because I had not been raised in my own family."

CULTURAL PATTERNS

Mr. V.'s father conducted a small grocery in Europe. He was barely able to make a living. Mr. V. never attended school, but was given some religious instruction. He has never attended night school in America. He cannot write English. He reads mostly newspapers. In Europe Mr. V. never learned a trade.

Mr. V. says that he was always serious, and worried about situations. He had a number of friends before his marriage and liked people. He sometimes attended shows and went to an occasional party. His ambition was to be happy and "have a nice life." He says, "I liked to know what was going on in the world, but I never had any time for reading."

Mrs. V. attended school in Europe, completing four years, which, she says, are equivalent to eight grades in this country. In America she learned to read and write English. At the age of ten Mrs. V. started to learn dressmaking.

Mrs. V. says that in America she rarely went to a show or party, but enjoyed "just being with her family." She had a number of girl acquaintances, but only one intimate girl friend.

According to Mrs. V., her father was "old fashioned." However, she had the greatest respect for both her parents.

Mrs. V. worked in a tailor shop before her marriage. She says that she found few people there with whom she cared to associate. The few girls in the shop were older and "I could not understand what they were talking about." The men were unrefined and told "dirty jokes and stories, which made me hate them."

In America Mrs. V. did very little reading and says, "I had time only for my family. My days were long in the shop and in the evening I made dresses for my sisters. I went only with them."

SOCIAL INTERACTION

A. *Factors in Adjustment and Conflict between Family and Community*

1. *Economic.* Mr. V. started work in America at \$4.50 a week. A year or so later he was earning \$9.00 a week in a chair factory. He worked at the Robert's Screw Company for \$9.00 a week, the work consisting of feeding a machine.

At the time of marriage, Mr. V. was working at the Spargo Electric Company and earning \$14.00 a week. He gradually increased his earnings, and the maximum was \$33.00, which included a bonus earned by working overtime. He has continued to work there except for a period of a few months when he had a small delicatessen store which proved an unsuccessful business venture. Mrs. V. says that this was the only time that her husband was ever "happy in his work."

Mr. V. complains that his work is too hard for him. Since 1927 he has found it at times unbearable. He says, "They know in the shop what a sick man I am, and they wonder how a man like me can do such hard work."

Mr. V. expresses a definite fear that he may lose his job, which would make him dependent since "no one else would hire a sick man," he says.

2. *Health.* Mr. V. complains of pains in his chest, of a choking sensation, of pain in his side and stomach, and of general weakness and nervousness. He has had numerous contacts with physicians. He has since early manhood been inclined to take a great deal of medicine, both of the patent variety as well as that prescribed by various physicians. He says, "I have always carried some kind of medicine in my pocket."

Mrs. V. has had one abortion performed, which was done without her husband's knowledge.

3. *Sex.* Mr. V. had sexual relations with prostitutes before his marriage, but says he has had no contacts since. When having contacts with prostitutes, he claims to have taken precautions against contracting a venereal infection. However, he worried a great deal, and it is quite evident that throughout his

married life, on occasions, he has associated his physical complaints with a possible venereal infection, although he insists that he has never been diseased.

Mrs. V. says that she experienced a shock before marriage, which affected somewhat her attitude toward sex after marriage. (See "Rationalizations.")

4. *Cultural.* Neither Mr. nor Mrs. V. belongs to any club. Mr. V. formerly belonged to a workingman's club. At the beginning of their marriage, the couple occasionally went out together to the home of friends, but now they never go out together. Neither Mr. nor Mrs. V. is religious.
5. *Pattern of Life.* Mr. V. shows a definite impotency in coping with his situation. His adjustment to his environment comes in the form of sickness and complaints. He is extremely sensitive. He is pessimistic. He has a tendency to be egocentric.

Mrs. V. is somewhat intelligent but has little insight into the situation. She has been an important factor in shaping her husband's behavior trends. She assumes the attitude of a martyr. She is evasive at times and has built up a protective armor of rationalizations. She has assumed the dominant role in the family group.

B. *Factors in Adjustment and Conflict within Family Group*

1. *Economic.* Up until the time of Mr. V.'s illness the family had been self-supporting. Mrs. V. had occasionally been employed to relieve the financial situation when Mr. V. lost time from work on account of illness. Mrs. V. says, "He never could work steady."

There has been little overt conflict over finances, Mrs. V. not blaming her husband when his earnings were small. She says, however, that she realized very soon after marriage what her life would be like. "He was a sick man and I could not expect much. It is the work which has made him sick. I tried to manage and not get aggravated."

Mr. V., however, feels keenly the fact that he is not able to earn more and is highly sensitive if his wife or children mention that they must deny themselves some pleasure or some

article of clothing. Particularly is this true of Mary, who complains about the clothing she must wear and the inability of her father to support the family adequately.

2. *Health.* Mr. V. complains of pains, headache, nervousness, indigestion, inability to sleep, etc. He claims that his physical condition is due to his work, which is too hard for him, and from aggravation from Mary. Mr. V. says, "I am sick. I have a pain in the stomach. Mary causes it. I can't eat with her. She makes me so I can't sleep all night."

Mrs. V. believes her husband to be weak and sick. Whatever feeling she has for him is maternal. However, even though he demands special attention and consideration, she is not willing that he usurp from her children any of her attention. In comparison with the children, especially Mary, Mr. V.'s position in the family is definitely inferior.

Mrs. V. says that she learned soon after marriage that her husband was not a well man, when she saw a red spot on the sheet. When questioned, he told her that he had been applying liniment to his side which hurt him. When she chided him for not telling her, he replied, "Why, do I have to tell you everything?"

Even before marriage Mrs. V. suspected that Mr. V. was not a strong man, and on one occasion called a physician to her mother's home to examine him. (See "Rationalizations.")

3. *Sex.* At the time of marriage, Mr. V. says he was strong sexually. During the first year of marriage, the couple had relations about once a week. After the birth of the second child relations occurred once in two weeks, and later once a month. During the past six or seven years intercourse has been very infrequent.

Mr. V. says that at times he thought he would go "mad" from lack of sexual satisfaction. Wet dreams and frequent nocturnal emissions have worried him a great deal. He has associated them with abnormality and weakness. More recently complete relations have been impossible. On these occasions Mrs. V. laughs at her husband, pointing out his weakness to him. It is quite clear that Mr. V. has associated his inability

to have complete relations with a fear that he is becoming impotent. Mr. V. claims he refused to use contraceptives because they make him nervous, but later explained that premature ejaculation occurs.

Masturbation is suspected, although Mr. V. explains that this would be harmful and physicians have cautioned him against it. Bloody nocturnal emissions over a period of some four or five weeks, which cleared up, are associated in his mind with fear of disease. This fear has manifested itself throughout his whole married life.

According to Mrs. V., sex conflict developed soon after marriage. Intercourse was very painful to her, but instead of explaining this to Mr. V., she made excuses. She knew little of sex, not even knowing how babies are born. When after marriage her mother talked to her, after Mr. V. had complained to the mother, she says, "I wouldn't let even my mother talk to me; I was so bashful. I just wished I had not married. I was so disappointed."

Mrs. V. says she rarely experiences an orgasm. She was anxious to have the first child, but did not want the other two children because of the pain of childbirth.

4. *Cultural.* Mr. V. says that early in their married life they sometimes went out together to the home of a friend. He complains that Mrs. V. will never go out alone with him, but always insists upon taking the children, particularly Mary. Because of this he refuses to go out at all.

Mr. V. reads only newspapers. He says, "I like to know what is going on in the world, but I can't be interested in reading because of Mary. She makes me too nervous to read."

RATIONALIZATIONS

Mr. V. tells the following:

"I was ambitious just to have a nice life. A friend of mine was going with a girl. He asked me to go along with him and meet his girl. I went to the theater with him and the girl had along her sister [Mrs. V.]. I got acquainted with her. I was about twenty years old at that time. She was working as a tailor. I was saving up a few dollars at

the time. I was making \$14.00 a week. I knew her eleven months. I figured I couldn't get married on \$14.00 a week. When I was going with her a little while, her mother asked me if I liked the girl. I said that I liked her all right, but I would rather wait and not marry her until I was making more. I didn't want my wife to have to work. I wanted a little business. I would have liked a candy store or a fruit store.

"I had gone out with other girls, but I thought this one was a very nice girl. I didn't like to spend money so well. I had other girls, but they wanted me to spend money on them. I was a poor boy and thought there was no use to go with girls who were after a fellow's money. She was different. I didn't want to marry so soon, but the mother gave me the idea that I would have to take her then or I wouldn't get her. I thought maybe if I waited I would be able to have a nice home.

"We got married. Her mother was glad. We had a lot of trouble the first year. It was a year and a half and she got in the family way. I didn't want a baby at first. I didn't care so much for children. I thought I wasn't making enough. My wife was small built. She did not want me. She didn't know anything about what it meant to be with a man. I had had relations with other women, but I never had been diseased. I was always afraid of disease. She made excuses to me and didn't want to be a wife.

"We didn't want the second child since I wasn't very strong, and I didn't make enough. My wife had the first child hard and she was afraid of having children. She didn't seem to care for a man. She made me nervous; she didn't want to stay with me. Sometimes we were together once a month. I started getting nervous; I had headaches; I had wet dreams all the time. I got so I couldn't control myself. I would start thinking about her and almost go wild. I worried about it. I thought it hurt my system; I thought it weakened me. Sometimes I tried not to think about it, but I couldn't put it out of my mind. She knew what I was going through. She laughed and told me that I could go to other women. I was young; I begged her. She saw how I was suffering. Then lately I got so I finished before I started; I was ashamed. My wife laughed at me and told me that I was too weak. I worried; I thought maybe I had a sickness.

"In 1927 I got sick. I went to work one day feeling sick. I strained myself. I was so afraid I would lose my job. I was often sick. I didn't like to stay home because I was afraid of losing my job. I

sometimes said my wife was sick and I had to stay home and take care of her. That day I got sick in the shop and had to go home. I couldn't walk up the steps; I fell. I had a choking sensation and a pain in my chest. It was a nervous breakdown. I had overworked my strength. I often felt pretty sick, but I didn't want my wife to worry. Then my wife went to work.

"Now I am better than I was at that time, but I am still a sick man. Work makes me to be sick, but Mary does more. The oldest girl is all right; but Mary, she has been my trouble since she was four years old, but every year worse. The youngest one is a nice girl. She is more like her mother. Mary is not a strong girl. She had appendicitis two years ago. She is a smart kid, but she is obstinate. I can't eat with her. I get a pain in my stomach. I am sick. Mary makes me sick. She causes everything. I don't like my job, but I can't help that, but with Mary, something has to be done. I feel good, then I come home, I get sick. Something goes to my system. It is all from Mary. I can't sleep all night; she aggravates me. I am not a nervous man, but she makes me to be wild. She upsets her mother too, but her mother won't say so. She has to be all the time by her mother. She can't be away from her. She goes to the bathroom with her mother. If her mother stays by the sink, she stays by the sink. She goes to the grocery with her. She has to be all the time with her. She even sleeps with the mother.

"Mary wants to be dressed like a queen. She wants everything. The other children want things, but they are satisfied if they can't have them. My wife doesn't complain, but Mary complains. She wants nice clothes. She wants to dress like a millionaire's daughter. I can't get them for her.

"When we were first married, we used to go out together. Now we can't go together; the children must go along. My wife won't go anywhere without Mary. I beg her to go with me alone.

"I can't do anything in the house. I can't even shave because I can't get in the bathroom long enough. Mary must get in. She doesn't give me a chance to take a bath. She has all day for the house, but I can't have fifteen minutes to myself. I can't have any time with my wife. It is Mary this and Mary that. I can't be interested in anything because of Mary.

"My wife has always been the boss in the house, but now it is Mary. If my wife ever asks me what I think about anything, Mary will say,

'What do you have to ask him for?' I feel discouraged; I admit it. I take tonics. They do me no good. I have to eat by myself. I can't eat with Mary at the table. If I eat breakfast with Mary at the table, I throw it up. I can't be alone in my room; Mary has to come in. My wife has to do everything as Mary says. I don't blame my wife because Mary makes her to be that way. Mary even makes her mother sleep with her. I feel I should be sleeping with my wife. I get so nervous when I think about it. My wife even cannot have sex relations with me because of Mary. If my wife gets up, Mary gets right up and asks, 'Where are you going? What are you leaving me for? Don't go away.' Maybe you think I am not a father, but I hate the girl. She is killing me. I have pains all over my system. If I ask her to do something for me, she says, 'I won't because you want me to do it.' She pulls at my clothes. She won't let me alone even if I don't pay attention to her. Everybody in the house has to pay attention to her. She screams and cries until she gets everything her own way. She makes my wife do everything the way she wants it. I tell you I can't stand it. Either she must leave the house or I must. She sticks me like needles."

Mrs. V. tells the following:

"When I was four years old I went to live with my aunt. My uncle came to visit our house and he took a liking to me. They had no children. He asked my parents if he could take me. We were so poor and my parents thought I would have more opportunity. My aunt and uncle fussed over me. They were not rich, but they could give me a good education. My aunt liked me so much. I liked my aunt and uncle, but I felt rather sorry for them because they had no children. I was never happy; I was always so lonesome. I wanted to be with my real parents and with my brothers and sisters. I never let my aunt know that I was unhappy because I didn't want to hurt her. My father and mother never came to see me very often because it was quite a distance away and they did not have the money to come with. Then afterwards they told me they were afraid to come because they thought I would want to go back with them. I had things that I would never have in my own home, but I can never remember being happy. I started to school at five and finished the four years. Then I learned to do dressmaking.

"I took everything so seriously then. Then my uncle died and my aunt remarried. When I was fourteen I went back with my family. I came to America with them. That was the happiest time of my life. I was happy because I was with my family again. I got work and I

paid every cent. I liked my brothers and sisters so much that I wanted to be all the time with them. I had a much better time than I had had as a child. My sisters made such a fuss over me.

"I was eighteen years old when I met my husband. My sister got married two months ahead. He was distantly related to my brother-in-law. I went around with him for nine months. I was a skirt operator and I was making \$14.00 a week. That was a lot of money at that time. I worked with a lot of men. I had gone out with a few men. A dress designer saw me and was interested in me. He said he would try to teach me to be a designer, but I found out he was interested in *me*. I was laughing about it because I never thought of marriage. I was not a boy chaser. I was not much attracted by men. Mr. V. was such a quiet man. That was the reason I was interested in him. My mother was more anxious that I get married. I can't blame her. I was considered like a baby by the family because I was the youngest sister. I figured if I had to get married, I might as well marry Mr. V. He was so nice and he thought the world of me. Everybody envied me. He was about twenty-four. Marriage didn't attract me. I couldn't cook. I was not anxious for a home. I had just found my family. My mother worried about me. I was such a young girl, working in a tailor shop. She thought something was sure to happen to me. She wanted to see me married. My mother told me that I was losing a chance in not marrying Mr. V. So I married him because my mother wanted me to. Then I thought that I wouldn't have to work if I got married, and I thought he would always be so good to me. He seemed so kind and different from other men. I worried some; he seemed sickly for a while. He lived across the street from my mother. He seemed to have such a bad cold and such a cough. My mother thought he wasn't getting the proper care so she asked him to come over to our house and stay for a while. One day I saw he had a plaster on his back and I had my mother call a doctor. He gave him an examination and the doctor said that he was all right; that he had no sickness.

"Then after we were married a short time I saw what I was in for. I found a small spot on the bed. He told me he had been putting on liniment as his side pained him. I saw that he was ailing, but he always tried to keep it from me.

"I was so disappointed right away in marriage. I didn't know anything about marriage. I just thought my husband would be good and kind to me. I was built small and it pained me so to stay with him. I didn't want him and he got so mad and so excited. I talked

it over with a friend and she told me that all men got mad like that. I was so disappointed. I didn't let him know it pained. He told me that I was too decent. I didn't know anything about sex. I had seen the dirty side of it. The tailors that I worked with told dirty stories. I hated tailors. Then one time I went to a shop to get work. It was up on the sixth or seventh floor. When I got to the shop I found it closed. I was about to leave when the elevator man came up and exposed himself to me. I was so frightened, I ran down all the steps into the street. I couldn't get it out of my mind. Later I got curious and asked the girls where I worked to tell me about sex. I asked them how children came. They laughed at me and told me that I was not old enough to know. But I did have a clean mind. My husband has always said *that* is what is wrong with me.

"Then when I got married I found my husband was not such a nice man. I thought he would be so fine. I found out that he was like the other men. He wanted sex relations. I saw he was no different from the elevator man and the tailors. When he complained to my mother, she tried to talk to me. I wouldn't listen. I was always bashful. I would never listen to such unclean things, even when my husband used to tease me and tell me that I was too decent a girl. There was something about it that I didn't like. After I was married I cried and just wished I hadn't married.

"I wanted the first baby. I was happy when I found out I was in the family way because I loved to have a baby. But I didn't know how children came. I felt bad and worried in some way, and I was afraid. After the first baby my husband started to get nervous, and I didn't want a second one because I wanted to be free. I saw what marriage was going to be like. Between the first and second child I had an abortion. I didn't tell my husband because he was always afraid something would happen to me. I used to feel sorry for him because he worried so about everything. He didn't like the first baby, but after she came he got so he liked her. She was very smart. The whole street knew her. The whole street was making a fuss about her. She had such pretty hair and she was so cute. Then he started paying attention to her and got so he liked her a great deal. The second one he never liked. She wasn't so pretty and didn't attract any attention like the oldest one. Mary always knew her father didn't like her as much as he did Julia. Even when she was a little girl, I can remember he picked Mary up one day and she said, 'Oh, do you like me, too?'

"My husband has been nervous since the first baby was born, but four years ago he got more nervous. He would scream and holler and he always thought he was right. Everyone had to agree with him. He never could work steady. He would get over-worked and had to stay home.

"Neither one of us wanted a third child. We didn't want more responsibility. But he liked the youngest child, Irene. He claims the youngest one looks like me. He says, 'Just look at the way she sleeps. Doesn't she look like you?' She was such a good baby, never caused any trouble. Mary doesn't look like him, but she has his ways. Since she was two and a half years old she was sickly. She is nervous, too. She is particular about her clothes. She screams and cries sometimes, then he curses her. I don't mind her noise myself, but I really believe he hates her. The oldest girl likes him more and is more respectful to him.

"My husband always has to have someone to pick on. He picked on my mother and then on my brother, and now on Mary. Next I am afraid he will pick on me. He said they made him sick and that they were trying to take me away from him.

"Nine years ago I started using a contraceptive device. I didn't tell him. He said it killed him. He said it was true that I was a decent girl, but my friends spoiled me. I never got any satisfaction and I was always afraid of pregnancy. I sleep with Mary, and it makes my husband so jealous. He doesn't want me to sleep with her.

"I feel sorry for my husband. At times I hate him. I suppose I must have some liking for him, or I wouldn't stand for it. My whole life has centered around my children. They come first. They have meant everything to me. I didn't want the second at first, but I like them so much.

"We never go places together. He wants me to just go with him. He is so jealous of the children. He is crazy about me.

"He was so crazy about me that when I met a friend of mine a few years ago from the shop and he saw that I was working he couldn't believe it. He said, 'And you should come to this! I thought your husband cared so much for you. All the girls envied you.'

"I feel rundown. I haven't much hope. I am not very happy. My oldest girl can't bring any children to the home because my husband

has to have everything quiet. He would like the whole family to go to bed at eight o'clock, when he does. He can't stand any noise.

"He really is a sick man. He is too sick and weak to stay with a woman. Sometimes I think that he believes I have done things which caused him to be nervous. But he loves me too much. He is always afraid something will happen to me. He tells me that he could never go on living without me. I know it is the work that is hurting him; I can prove it. It makes him weak and nervous, not me. Sometimes I am afraid he will blame me.

"I love my children more than I love my husband. I love all the children about the same. The oldest one got more attention at first because she was the only one I had. I only feel sorry for my husband. I know he cries and that he cares so much for me."

Mr. V., although the youngest of the family, early had an orphan role. He was neglected by his family and was given responsibility at an age when even children in Europe enjoyed some freedom. A later tendency to worry and fear seems to have grown out of this earlier precarious existence. This precariousness undoubtedly developed out of his detached family pattern and his lack of training in a trade. Employment and responsibility at such an early age probably increased his *fatigability* and led to exaggerated complaints of illness.

The background of Mrs. V., on the other hand, was quite the antithesis of Mr. V.'s. While she was a middle child in a large family, at the age of four she went to live with her aunt and uncle, who were childless, and thus grew up as an "only child." Reunited with her family at the age of fourteen, she became the favorite child, protected and catered to, and received the attention which would normally be given the youngest child.

Having learned a trade in Europe, it was not difficult for Mrs. V. to find acceptable work. Her schooling, also, was an asset. While all of this facilitated her economic adjustment, Mrs. V.'s interest was entirely centered in her family. Accordingly, she lived rather a sheltered life, her family contacts constituting her social world. Thus she remained more or less aloof from her fellow workmen in the shop in which she worked.

Mrs. V.'s meager knowledge of sex was consistent with her sheltered background. Her contacts with tailors at work furnished her with some nondescript references to sex which aroused both her curiosity and resentment while giving her no authentic information. Her witnessing the exposure of the elevator operator, accordingly, naturally produced a severe sex shock, which was later to influence her marriage relations.

Mrs. V. married Mr. V. expecting him to be different from the other men she had known. She was not anxious to get married since she found security and response in her family group. Because of her mother's urging, however, she acquiesced. Sex conflict arises almost immediately after marriage. Mr. V. does not appreciate his wife's puritanical ideas regarding sex or her inexperience and fearfulness. He, himself, was more experienced having had sexual contacts before marriage. Already believing that "sex is unclean," her husband's behavior only confirms her aversions. Complete disillusionment follows her realization that her husband after all was no different from the "tailors and elevator man," toward whom she felt the greatest revulsion.

As time goes on, the husband, more and more dissatisfied with the situation, falls back upon his earlier tendency to worry and fear. He notices that he is more nervous and has frequent headaches. Thus he decided that his lack of complete sexual satisfaction is undermining his health. He complains of illness and sometimes loses time from work. Added to Mrs. V.'s early revulsion toward sex, comes the association of sex relations with childbirth. This not only increases her lack of satisfaction, but gives her an added excuse and justification for refusal to engage in frequent marital relations.

The sexual antagonism soon spreads to the response realm. There are no frank discussions either on matters of sex or of other topics. There is lack of understanding of how either feels in any situation. The wife feels misunderstood, but there is a way out for her—sublimation of response to her children. This, accordingly, only increases Mr. V.'s feeling of neglect.

Loss of time from work because of "ill health" reacts un-

favorably upon the economic situation. There are periods when Mrs. V. has to go to work, and others when the family is able to get along only by the greatest economy. At other times they are dependent. Hard work to a man who has never known anything else becomes more and more distasteful. Mechanical work in a factory is uninteresting. He aspires to have his own business, but upon trying makes a complete failure of it. But a man does not have to work at tiresome tasks if he is ill. Thus one sees Mr. V. rationalizing: "I am a sick man—I must not work so hard."

But illness, while it furnishes an excuse from work, also lowers Mr. V.'s status in his family. He is looked upon by both his wife and children as providing them with inadequate support. How can he, however, he asks himself, support them adequately if he is ill? Thus the feeling of economic incompetency only further aggravates the health conflict by placing an even greater premium upon illness as an escape mechanism.

In Mr. V.'s "illness" Mrs. V. finds an escape and justification for her refusal to engage in frequent sex relations with her husband. "My husband is sick anyway, intercourse is not good for him." On each occasion he attempts intercourse, his "illness," his "weakness," and inferiority are pointed out to him. On these occasions he feels his manhood is on trial. His "nervousness" and fears increase. He recalls his earlier contacts with prostitutes and fears that his present situation may be due to a venereal disease, although he insists he has never had such an infection. Sexual intercourse is so infrequent that it produces premature ejaculations and nocturnal emissions, both of which are interpreted as indications of weakness and therefore of inferiority.

Mr. V.'s feeling of sexual inferiority intrenches even more securely his inferior role in the family group. To the wife the children come first; to the children the mother is of first consideration. In only one respect is Mr. V. able to dominate—he demands that his household be quiet after 8 P.M. when he goes to bed. This is accomplished through the plea of "illness."

Resentment toward his wife for his precarious position in the

family, however, does not find direct expression as one might expect. Instead it is directed toward Mary, the middle child. To understand this conflict certain earlier attitudes need to be taken into account.

Mr. V. was very early indifferent toward children in general and did not want a child. The first child, however, he accepted when she attracted attention from persons outside the family, by her "pretty hair and cute ways." He was proud of her and soon became attached to her.

Mary, the second child, likewise was not wanted. She was a fussy baby and required a great deal of her mother's attention. Her virtues were entirely surpassed by the older child, Julia, and there was no opportunity for her to win over her father. She soon became aware of her father's indifference to her and preference for her sister. Upon being kissed on one occasion, she remarked, "Oh, you like me, too?"

Four years after Mary's birth, Irene was born. She was like Julia, a good baby, requiring a minimum of attention. As she grew older, she began to remind Mr. V. of his wife by her looks and mannerisms—the wife whom he idealized.

At first Mr. V.'s resentment toward his wife was directed toward members of her family. For a time, also, he discovered that by being "ill" he could control the situation more in his own interests, but this furnished only temporary "adjustment." Mary, too, was ill and made complaints. As time went on, she demanded more and more of her mother's attention, going every place with her, even sleeping with her. Mr. V. became more and more neglected, as he thought, all because of Mary, who demanded attention for herself. Thus in her attempt to get attention Mary has provided her father with a ready means of rationalizing his wife's inattention to him. Thus he says, "Mary won't let my wife sleep with me; Mary won't let my wife go out with me," etc. In this way Mary has become the scapegoat for Mr. V.'s resentment toward his wife instead of her family as had been the situation earlier, though in a much less exaggerated form.

Health, economic, and family conflicts appear on the sur-

face as symbolic of sex, response, and personality conflicts. On the surface, conflict between Mary and her father seems baffling and unreasonable. When one understands, however, that much of the disappointment Mr. V. has experienced in his marriage and the blame which he would ordinarily have fixed upon his wife, he has transferred to Mary, the situation becomes more comprehensible. In the interest of idealization, Mr. V. is able to make excuses for his wife in situations which otherwise might call out hatred and intense conflict. Thus Mary and her father become rivals for the affection of the mother and wife, utilizing the same devices—temper tantrums and illness.

Obviously any attempt at treatment cannot succeed which does not recognize the fact that the parent-child conflict provides an outlet for the domestic discord. And yet ordinarily the parent-child conflict would constitute the whole of the situation to be treated, perhaps by the clinician reproving the father for his attitude toward the child, or by removing her from the home.

From the preceding analysis, therefore, it is clear that successful treatment of the V. case requires dealing with the domestic-discord situation. Of chief importance in this approach would be an attempt to modify substantially the attitudes of the husband and wife, not only toward each other but toward Mary as well, through a process of interpretation. Precautions need to be taken, however, to insure substantial modifications in Mr. V.'s attitudes of hostility rather than merely a change of focus from Mary to his wife.

How the necessary modification of attitudes is accomplished in the V. case, as well as in other cases of domestic discord, involves the application of a series of complex techniques through which the analysis is utilized. In this way analysis is an integral part of the treatment process, though far from constituting the whole of it, as is sometimes assumed. For the application of treatment techniques is as highly an involved process as is the analysis which precedes it.

•

CHAPTER XIII

TREATMENT PROCESSES

The more fundamental attitudes, as has been shown, have their genesis in the early life of the individual. Accordingly, they are ingrained in the personality and are centered around desires, ambitions, goals, ideals, etc. This identification with the core of the personality gives to these attitudes a high emotional content. These may be called the primary attitudes, since they develop chiefly in primary contacts and are more elemental than those which are formed later. It is the primary attitudes with which the treatment process is concerned.

Treatment consists in changing those primary attitudes which act as an impediment to accord in marriage relations. This, however, is not a simple process. In fact the social therapist is often deceived into thinking that he is changing fundamental attitudes when actually he is only modifying temporary attitudes. For example a husband's refusal to pay rent may only be a temporary attitude of retaliation toward his wife, growing out of a sex-response-cultural conflict. It cannot be accepted, accordingly, as reflecting the husband's more deep-seated attitudes toward his wife. Attempt at treatment, therefore, should not be directed toward modification of the attitude of retaliation but toward change of those attitudes constituting the basic conflict pattern.

An understanding of the genetic or developmental history of attitudes or sets of attitudes is necessary before attempting to change them. Certain factors have been thought of as having some degree of influence upon this process of change. Some of these, however, are of less consequence than one might expect. Chronological age, for example, is of relatively little importance

except as old age is approached.¹ The length of duration of an attitude likewise is of relatively little importance except to the extent that it is more primary and is, accordingly, more closely associated with the core of the personality.

The life pattern is thus made up of certain dominant primary attitudes which are more difficult to change than those not so intimately tied up with the personality. Take, for example, the life pattern which is characterized by pessimism. Here the dominant attitude of pessimism is more difficult to change or modify than the occasional attitude of pessimism expressed by another individual.

It follows, accordingly, that if the attitudes which hinder adjustment in marriage are those which make up the life pattern, then they are more difficult to change. This is true whether the life pattern is an adjusted or an unadjusted one. Nevertheless, there are some striking differences in the treatment of cases of domestic discord, due to differences in life patterns.

In the case of the adjusted life pattern, treatment consists in modifying only the element which makes for domestic discord rather than reorganizing the whole of the personality. This involves, therefore, a shift in emphasis rather than a radical transformation in the life pattern. For example, women with puritanical backgrounds frequently have attitudes toward sex which hinder adjustment in the marriage relationship. These attitudes, however, are not of such a nature as to give a dominant tone to the life pattern though they may constitute a segment of it. Treatment thus involves only such change in the attitudes toward sex as will facilitate marriage relations and yet in no way alter fundamentally the basic life pattern.

In the case of the unadjusted life pattern, on the other hand, the problem of the social therapist is to bring about a reorganization of the personality. Thus in the case of the escape-response the objective is to modify the life pattern to such an extent that the individual no longer habitually utilizes escape mechanisms in meeting situations, whether in or outside marriage.

But whether the situation requires a complete change in the

¹Of the group studied, ages ranged from 27 to 50 years.

pattern of life, or only some modification of an element in that pattern, the processes are essentially the same from the standpoint of the techniques involved. One of these processes of modifying attitudes is that of *reinterpreting the individual's experiences*. Another process is *the redefinition of situations*. These two contrasting approaches in treatment, however, are not mutually exclusive because they are to a certain extent supplementary.

The process of redefinition of situations consists of giving new meaning to old situations and can probably best be illustrated by the following simple illustration. A woman who has been married several years maintains that sex is unclean. In the process of treating this attitude, the social therapist may place sex expression in the same category with other natural functions, such as eating. He then proceeds to point out the inconsistency of taking one set of attitudes toward one function and an adverse set of attitudes toward a similar function. Accordingly, sex is put in a new setting to the extent that it is made to appear like the other. In other words, the situation is redefined on a rational rather than an emotional basis.

It may, however, be necessary for the social therapist to do more than simply give the experience a new setting. That is, it may be necessary to tie up the redefinition of the situation with *a reinterpretation of the life processes*. He may need to show the wife how her attitudes toward sex fit into a general pattern which is characteristic of a particular person with certain experiences. For example, a woman's present attitudes toward sex may be the outgrowth of her pampered and protected role as a child, her lack of association with boys, her retreat into a dream world with a dream lover, her shock upon the occasion of first intercourse, etc. Her withdrawal from sex experience is thus but a part of the larger pattern of avoiding all contacts which call for adjustments along lines to which she is not accustomed.

Thus the process of redefining situations is that of transferring a set of attitudes from one experience to another (in the above illustration from food activities to sex). The process of reinterpreting behavior, on the other hand, is directed toward

giving the individual a genetic explanation of the attitudes in question and showing him how that development has been dominated by a consistent trend or pattern. It is true, of course, that this latter process by implication tends to result in a redefinition of the situation.

Primary in the treatment process is the first interview in which not only are data obtained for analysis but in which the therapeutic process is initiated. The purpose of the first interview from the standpoint of treatment is twofold: (1) to get the patient to take a more objective attitude toward his problem, and (2) to give him an interpretation which will carry through the whole treatment process and with which further work can be co-ordinated.

Most individuals, before they have taken their problems to a social therapist, have already worked out interpretations of their situations. These explanations of their difficulties, however, are usually moralistic. That is, the person tends to select such an interpretation as will be accepted and confirmed by relatives and friends and which will absolve him of all blame and responsibility. Accordingly, he is usually overtly antagonistic toward his marriage partner, as well as toward others who have taken sides with the other person, defining the situation in terms of praise and blame. He, therefore, hopes in his first contact with the social therapist to be told that he is right and his marriage partner wrong. In order to safeguard his interests and assure himself that he is not to blame, it is often necessary for him to resurrect his emotions in order to substantiate his position.

The social therapist, however, is not interested in fixing the blame upon the husband and wife, but, as was pointed out in the preceding chapter, he is concerned with getting at the attitudes and events leading to the domestic discord. This he is able to do through use of an interviewing technique (see Chapter II).

Once, however, the analysis is arrived at in the interview process, the problem for the social therapist becomes that of giving this interpretation to the patient. This process is crucial in treatment because it involves not only interpreting the behavior

of the patient on the part of the social therapist, but also getting him to accept this interpretation. His acceptance depends to a large degree upon the extent to which the analyst is able to identify the patient with the analysis or interpretation. In other words, it is necessary that the analysis of factors come out of the facts as presented by the patient himself, and that he see that this is true.

What many social therapists do is to superimpose upon the patient an interpretation which is in no way identified with him. Obviously such a process cannot lead to successful treatment. The patient must be made to feel that the analysis is simply another phase of his personality. In this sense he is simply being aided in interpreting his own situation. It is, in other words, his own analysis.

How the patient is identified with the analysis is illustrated in the following case, in which the patient was constantly reminded that the interpretation was based upon the factors brought to light through his own account:

"You tell me that you were the youngest of the family, that you were made to feel that you were different. You say that you felt superior to your brothers and sisters. You have explained to me that you cared a great deal for your father, but you did not care for your mother because she was always complaining. She never told you anything about sex, but you were told to keep away from boys. You read love stories and were very romantic, weren't you? You fell in love with a boy you say, but he couldn't marry you because he was forced to marry another girl. You felt upset. You didn't know how to meet the situation. You felt you could not face it so you looked about for some way out. You thought of several possibilities, finally selecting suicide. But you say, you thought that if you committed suicide your father might misunderstand you and think you had not been a good girl.

"Then you thought of another way out; why not go to America? You remembered you had a cousin there. You wrote your cousin and he arranged for your passage. But when you got here you say you were disappointed. Let's see, is that right? You were faced with the problem of finding work, but, as you say, you had never worked. You hated the idea! Again you looked for a way out. You felt blocked in

about the same way you had back in your home town in Europe. Again there was the possibility of suicide, but there was still another way out; escape through marriage to your cousin. As you explained, you did not love him, but you thought he would be good to you and take care of you. It was not unusual in Europe for cousins to marry. You were lonely and you wanted some one to care for you. You thought your cousin would be dependable.

"But having been a shy girl, as you pointed out, and having led a sheltered life, you didn't know what marriage actually meant. The sexual side had never occurred to you. You say you didn't know what the whole thing was about. You had intercourse the first night. You say that you were torn and hurt; that you were small and it was very painful. For four days you felt sick from the pain. Your husband, you thought, was 'green and inexperienced.' Of course, it didn't occur to you that it was very natural for you to feel that way, never having been told anything about sex. You were brought up to believe it was a thing not to discuss. Your husband also was inexperienced. Of course, it is different nowadays. Children are brought up to know all about sex, and now there is a tendency for couples planning to marry to go to a doctor who specializes in that sort of thing so there won't be misunderstandings.

"Then, as you have explained, four days after marriage you got sick and went to the hospital. You don't remember that there was anything wrong with you except that you felt pains all over. But anyway you were glad to get away from everything. Things seemed unbearable. So you really met the first problem of marriage by going to the hospital. And as you have told me, you have been meeting new problems ever since by going to the hospital. You say you have been in the hospital thirteen times; each time for a different ailment.

"You didn't want a baby. You hated your first baby and at first you wouldn't take care of it. You felt that you were no more than a baby yourself and that you should be in the baby's place, receiving the attention and the petting. You missed all the petting that you had as a child. You felt jealous of the baby. Of course, you felt that it was rather wrong for you to feel that way; jealous of your own baby. Then you realized that you could get attention, also—much as the baby was getting—by being sick. I don't know, of course, I am not sure that was the case. You probably know whether or not that is what happened. It is true that most people do get more attention when they complain of being sick, don't they? We are all somewhat like that. Were you any different from that? From all that you have

told me about your feelings—quite frankly, you know—we would say that was what happened, wouldn't we?

"You never got any satisfaction out of staying with your husband. At first it was painful; then when you got over that, you really wanted to, but never enjoyed it. It is hard for you to think of yourself as actually wanting to stay with your husband as you still hold to those old ideas that it is shameful for a woman to admit that she wants sexual relations. Of course, it is natural for you to have those ideas. Many women have had them in the past, but now we are taught to believe differently. It does us harm to want something and always feel that we shouldn't. Wanting sex relations is no different from wanting anything else; food, for example. It seemed to you that your husband was always in a hurry to stay with you and get it over with. You never got any satisfaction, but you never talked to him because you thought it was no use. You got more and more disgusted and resentful because you blamed him. Then you told him you were sick and that you couldn't stay with him. Again it seems you used sickness as a way of getting out of something which was unpleasant to you.

"Of course, all of us are inclined to develop excuses for not doing things which are unpleasant. If we have an appointment with someone we don't like, we sometimes 'develop' a headache. We 'kid' ourselves a lot sometimes, or at least try to do so. So it isn't so unusual—this thing of using sickness as a way of escaping unpleasant things—but sometimes a person does it so often that he just reacts that way mechanically. He actually *believes* he is sick. Perhaps that is true in your situation. Do you think you have used sickness as an excuse all through your marriage?"¹ [At this point Mrs. A.A. showed her acceptance of this part of the analysis by saying: "It is true that I know if I get sick enough, someone else will do things for me. I hate housework; it gets under my skin to do it. If I get 'sick,' I don't have to do it. I know when I go out with my husband in the car and I don't want to go, but I feel I should go, that I come back always feeling all kinds of pains although I felt real good when I started. Maybe it is because I didn't want to go in the first place."]

"You blame your husband because you do not get any sexual satisfaction. Yes, it is probably true that you blame him less now than you did when you first came in. You say he got his 'satisfaction' and

¹It would have taken much less time, obviously, to have told Mrs. A. A. that she imagined her "illness," as is not infrequently done in such cases.

you did not get yours. After I explain something of the physiology of sex to you, just in a general way, let us see if your husband is any different from other men. Is there any reason why he would behave or feel any differently in the situation than other men feel or behave? [Here the relation between infrequency of sexual relations and rapidity with which climax is reached on the part of a man was pointed out, with the resultant lack of satisfaction on the part of a woman; the effect of *coitus interruptus*, etc.] Your husband, being no different from other men, of course, feels disgusted and upset. He isn't any more satisfied than you are, you see. He does not blame you, either, just as you do not blame him now that these things [sex] have been explained to both of you."

Thus the process by which the interpretation is given to the patient and accepted by him is one of *interaction*. He is identified with the analysis throughout. Just as in the interview he was aided by the social therapist in telling his story, in initiating the treatment process he is aided in analyzing his account once it is told. The interpretation is discussed leisurely, by both the patient and the social therapist. The patient is encouraged to give applications of the interpretation to various incidents in his life. Here is the test as to whether the patient is simply agreeing with the social therapist for the moment or whether the analysis has actually become a tool for his own use.

Successful treatment, accordingly, calls for as little personal identification of the social therapist with the analysis as possible. Prestige, it is true, inevitably enters into the situation and may be said to be an important factor. However, it is intellectual prestige that is important as over against emotional. The patient may feel in the beginning of the interview that the therapist is a pleasing and sympathetic person. As the interview progresses, however, he becomes conscious of the fact that the therapist is broadminded and impartial and that he seems to have a superior grasp of a situation which is someone else's situation. This intellectual *rapprochement* should be well established by the time the interview is completed in order that the patient's emotional reactions may be directed into rational channels.

Another result of the interview process is that of producing certain cathartic effects which both facilitate and constitute a

part of the treatment. Early in the interview these sometimes take the form of spontaneous emotional releases, frequently through crying. Later, however, this emotional relief gives way to releases through being able to verbalize without inhibitions those elements which previously the individual has had to repress.

This verbalization of repressed emotions is, in fact, the most important of cathartic releases. Thus a man may secure considerable relief by being aided in discussing for the first time a rivalry or hatred for a brother, which has influenced his whole life process. Or take the case of a man who feels that some of his behavior is abnormal. He fears that he is different from other men; he becomes more and more sensitive and interprets any so-called slights on the basis of his supposed "abnormality." Through being able to discuss this behavior, and in being helped to analyze it, the nature of the experience is changed. That is, the element of fear is removed from it and he no longer looks upon it as something of which to be ashamed.

Once the objective interpretation worked out by the patient and social therapist has displaced the "moralistic" or emotional approach previously held by the patient, he is able to analyze his own behavior as if it were that of someone else. Not only is he able to take "the attitude of the other" in regard to his own behavior but toward that of his marriage partner as well. This is made possible throughout the process of analysis by interpreting the behavior of the marriage partner along with that of the patient. In relating objectively the factors which seem to have led up to the conflict situation, any feeling of antagonism or blame toward the marriage partner is dispelled as it is toward the patient himself.

Furthermore, with understanding comes tolerance. Once a wife understands her husband's behavior and sees how it is the result of factors for which he is not responsible, she is more tolerant and patient, allowing the social therapist time to treat the situation. When a situation is viewed in all its complexity, and both marriage partners realize that their conflict "did not arise suddenly and mysteriously," but had its origin even before

their marriage, they are not going to expect sudden and miraculous adjustments. In the past social therapy has been too much concerned with the superficial aspects of the situation. The social therapist too often has been an oracle, telling the patient either that his difficulties are "imaginary" or "exaggerated" and expecting that after one superficial interview the conflict will magically disappear.

In contrast to this older point of view, the persons experiencing the conflict are told quite frankly that it will require a considerable length of time before they can expect any results.

"It may take a period of months to accomplish very much. It is up to you to decide whether you want someone to work on the situation. I have given you an idea of the treatment recommended. This is given on the basis of an understanding of all the factors involved; you know, a doctor gives you a physical examination and then prescribes medicine. Of course, the doctor doesn't force the medicine upon the patient. It is up to the patient. The same is true here. I am not saying you have to follow out the treatment. It is up to you, but we don't want to start unless we can carry it out, do we? So I want you to understand clearly what it means."

Thus while it is possible during the first interview for the social therapist and patient to work out an objective analysis of the patient's situation which he accepts, this does not mean that he is expected to carry through this objective view in its entirety. Once the process is initiated it calls for persistent reiteration.

While later treatment is to a large degree directed toward segments, the general analysis is never disregarded. It is always the task of the therapist to co-ordinate the treatment of the segments with the more comprehensive pattern. Accordingly, while treatment in many instances may be directed toward the sex conflict, response conflict, health conflict, or what not, it cannot be dissociated from its context in the larger pattern, both with reference to the elements in the marriage situation and the development of personality. Thus treatment itself needs to be integrated, not only in the mind of the therapist, but in that of the patient in such a way as to make clear the connections between the various elements and their relationship to the whole.

Since it is frequently necessary to depend to some extent upon the services of certain specialists such as the physician, the psychologist, and the sex hygienist, co-ordination is facilitated when treatment is approached by persons with similar points of view. It is essential, accordingly, for the therapist to work hand in hand with those persons called upon for specialized service. It is advisable, also, that these specialists have as clear an understanding of the social situation as does the social therapist.

This understanding on the part of the physician in a case of escape-response, for example, may be of utmost importance. Suppose a program of treatment is in the process of being launched by the social therapist. The wife is a typical escape-response type, using illness as an escape from responsibilities and unpleasant situations. She has accepted the analysis in the situation but occasionally tends to fall back upon her habitual type of response. She goes to a physician who, while recognizing that her complaints have little physical basis, nevertheless is impressed by her story and suggests a rest home. Thus she is encouraged by the physician to use the very technique of adjustment which the social therapist is endeavoring to correct. On the other hand, had the physician had a better understanding of the situation he could have greatly facilitated treatment by repeating enough of the analysis to have made clear his point of view, thus reinforcing the work of the social therapist rather than counteracting it.

The sex hygienist, likewise, may play a very important role in the treatment of domestic discord. In the larger number of cases with which the writer is familiar, instruction in sex hygiene was strongly indicated. Instruction in the use of contraceptives, medical treatment of physical anomalies, instruction in the mechanics and physiology of the sex act, education in the understanding and appreciation of the sex impulse and its physiological nature, etc., are of the greatest importance in the treatment of domestic-discord cases. However, this treatment by the sex hygienist needs to be co-ordinated with the rest of the treatment process if it is to be effective in the more complex

situations. As has been pointed out in preceding chapters, sex conflict is for the most part cultural in origin. Therefore, any amount of physiological description of the sexual nature of the individual and what normally occurs in sexual intercourse will not alone break down the emotional aversion to the experience built up in the early life of the person. This is particularly true, of course, where the sexual difficulty arises out of personality disorganization.

Even in those cases where sexual maladjustment is basically physiological, this does not preclude its reinforcement through psychological elements. More commonly, however, the difficulty is almost, if not entirely, psychological. Obviously, so long as there are psychological elements involved, these are more likely to be neglected by the sex hygienist, especially where they grow out of a pronounced trend in the personality. For example, take the case of a woman who complained that she receives no satisfaction from sex contact with her husband. Physical examinations of both husband and wife revealed no basis for her complaints. In studying the case, however, it was found that the wife had been married previously. Up until her second marriage she had led a free-lance life and had been intolerant of conventionality. Her first husband was home only occasionally, but she derived great sexual satisfaction from their relationship; she also enjoyed intercourse with her present husband prior to their marriage, but after marriage complained constantly of dissatisfaction. It was quite obvious that this dissatisfaction grew out of the wife's mental conflict in comparing the second husband with the first and in identifying intercourse with the second husband as a "conventional" experience. Thus while the physical examination on the part of the sex hygienist furnished basic materials upon which to project a treatment program, it provided no understanding of the psychological factors involved, which in this instance were of paramount importance.

In much the same way, the services of the psychologist, both in terms of mental and of special ability tests, need to be co-ordinated with the larger pattern of treatment. While it is impor-

tant to know whether or not an individual has special ability or even average ability along certain lines, it is of even greater importance to understand thoroughly his personality and the social conditions under which he would have to adjust. Thus a man having sufficient mechanical ability and muscular co-ordination to drive a motor vehicle might fail completely as a cabdriver where his success depended upon soliciting customers, and yet be highly successful as a streetcar motorman or a long-distance hauler. Mental and special ability tests, accordingly, provide the social therapist with an index to the capacities of the patient but do not indicate how these can best be utilized in social situations.

Another aspect of the treatment process is that in which other individuals are instructed in their responses to the patient. This may include, in addition to the marriage partner, a relative or friend who is very intimately connected with the situation. Even though the marriage partner may understand and accept the analysis worked out in the situation, when faced with certain difficult problems, he cannot at least in the early stages of treatment be expected to respond with full understanding, unless he is given patient direction. For example, the husband of a woman who has escaped responsibilities through complaints of "illness" and "spells" may on the whole have considerable insight into his wife's problem. Nevertheless, when faced with one of her "spells," the husband may fall back upon his habitual form of response—that of calling a physician—thus symbolizing to the wife that he regards her as ill. It is necessary, therefore, for the social therapist to anticipate many of these problems in individual cases, instructing the proper person in his response. Likewise, as the treatment progresses and certain positive attempts at adjustment on the part of one of the individuals are noted, it is often advisable to instruct the other individual in how to meet and encourage these attempts or gestures.

On the whole, it is highly advisable that relatives or close associates not be considered in the treatment process except in exceptional instances when they are active participants in the case. There are many who believe, it is true, that practically all

relatives are participants in domestic-discord situations. To the extent that they take sides, this is of course true; and yet so long as they do not interfere with the treatment process this is not of great importance. The social therapist assumes that most relatives are emotional in their approach. Ordinarily, therefore, he neither takes the relatives into account as a source of material, nor does he discuss the case with them. To do so would violate the confidential relationship between the social therapist and the husband and wife, upon which successful treatment so definitely depends.

Occasionally, however, it may be necessary to instruct a relative in his response to the patient if the therapist feels that this person is retarding treatment. This may involve nothing more than getting the relative to recount his activities in the situation and then interpreting this role and the effect it is having upon the patient. The interview of the relative and the interpretation of the patient's situation must, of course, be as skillfully done as with the patient himself. The goal is to get the relative to assist spontaneously in the treatment process and yet judiciously avoid giving any basis for being charged with violating the confidential relationship with the patients.

There may, of course, be an occasional instance when work with a relative needs to be quite intensive. The writer has in mind the case of a woman who complained of "heart trouble," although there was no physical basis for her complaints. She refused to take care of her house or children or to have marital relations with her husband. It was learned that she lived next door to an older sister who also complained of "heart trouble," although to a lesser degree. The two sisters spent a great deal of time together discussing their ailments, even to the extent of feeling each other's heartbeats.

The therapist early in the treatment process took the older sister into her confidence, giving her the interpretation of the case, and succeeded in getting the sister to accept it. The purpose of doing this was explained to the husband in order to dispel any misunderstanding or antagonism on his part, since he disliked his sister-in-law and had tried unsuccessfully for years to per-

suade his wife to move away from her sister. The consent of the wife to talk frankly to her sister was also obtained.

The process of giving the older sister understanding of the patient's situation was inevitably intertwined with that of giving her understanding into her own personality in order that she would more clearly comprehend the relationship between herself and the patient. Both processes were necessary in the treatment of the case since so many of their activities were in common. Recognizing this identification, no direct attempt was made to break up the close relationship between the sisters since that would only have tended to make the situation more artificial even though one were able to prevent antagonism. Yet since the treatment was directed toward bringing about a closer identification between husband and wife, this inevitably resulted in some loss of identity between the sisters as was of course intended by the therapist. This change, however, was accomplished gradually with the older sister actually participating in the process.

While the general treatment processes, as has already been seen, are essentially alike in all cases of domestic discord, variations in details and points of emphasis have to be made in terms of the types of cases. This can probably best be illustrated by discussing the treatment processes involved in the various types of cases earlier presented.

The *Conflicting-Roles* type of domestic discord usually comes to the attention of the therapist following a crisis situation precipitated by one of the marriage partners in an attempt to force the other to make some definite move or decision. Thus in the case of Mr. E. (Chapter IV), the services of the social therapist were sought immediately following the filing of a divorce bill on the part of the wife, which was merely a gesture in an attempt to force her husband to choose between herself and the "other woman," although Mrs. E. secretly declared that she would never give up her husband.

It was quite evident, as was pointed out in the analysis of this situation (Chapter IV), that Mr. E.'s mental conflict would not have been any the less intense in the event of a complete

break with his wife. He was as dependent, and in all probability more so, upon his wife than upon Mrs. A., because Mrs. A. stood out only as a "type" of woman who would attract him rather than as an "individual."

From the standpoint of social therapy there were two possible courses of procedure open: either Mr. E.'s attitudes must be changed or modified to facilitate greater accord, or Mrs. E. must be persuaded to accept much of her husband's behavior. A combination of the two seemed more feasible than either one alone. It was necessary first to interpret Mr. E.'s behavior to himself in such a way that he would accept the interpretation. Because of his flare for the dramatic, caution needed to be taken not to convey to Mr. E. that his behavior was "unusual" or his personality "unique."

Mrs. E. likewise needed to be given insight into her husband's behavior and instruction in her own control of her responses toward him. It seemed necessary to explain to her the extent of the adjustment that could be hoped for, which was not entirely optimistic in view of the fact that there had always been other women in Mr. E.'s life. Furthermore, conflict between individual standards and group standards had been present with Mr. E. since early boyhood and probably would continue always.

As a part of the treatment of Mr. E.'s personality difficulties, an attempt was made to strengthen his "conventional" role in society which had previously been of much greater importance than at the present. This meant reinstatement in lodges. Another means was through building up a closer relationship between Mr. E. and his children, several of whom were able to be given insight into the situation, but who had previously reacted emotionally to it.

The outstanding characteristic of this type of case from the standpoint of therapy is the need for decisive action on the part of the therapist, without, of course, the patient realizing this, since what he lacks particularly is ability to make his own decisions. This type of case usually lends itself to treatment because of the extent to which the patient can be influenced, and

owing to the fact that there are certain very definite accord factors upon which to work.

The Dual-Roles type of individual, however, is not so hopeful with reference to modification of the personality. So far as the domestic discord is concerned, however, there is little difference in prognosis in the two types. The extent to which modification of the personality is feasible is, of course, determined by the degree of dissociation present.

Since there is alteration between two or more roles, one of which is ordinarily congenial to the marriage partner, treatment is directed toward minimizing the conflict when the congenial personality is no longer present. In the case of Mr. K. (Chapter V), for example, where two roles have been played with almost perfect consistency, treatment directed toward interpretation of his own life processes was not feasible because of the degree to which the dissociation was buttressed by rationalizations. Treatment, therefore, had to be directed toward interpreting Mr. K.'s behavior to his wife. Much of the overt conflict had centered around Mrs. K.'s feeling that her husband was a converted "Jew." Accordingly his "undesirable" personality was associated in her mind with his non-Jewish personality. To a large extent, this cultural conflict was minimized by showing Mrs. K. how her husband's ideas on religion were inevitably the result of his early "shifting environment," pointing out the genesis of an individual's religious attitudes and the effect of certain contacts upon them.

Through the process of redefinition of the situation, likewise, much of Mr. K.'s behavior was given a new setting as far as his wife was concerned. For example, his "swindling" women (to which Mrs. K. seems not to have objected if it meant an increased income) was placed in the same category as many activities in big business. The techniques which he used in arousing the sympathy and interest of the women with whom he came in contact through his work as a salesman were not so different from those often used and thought of as so-called good salesmanship in some groups. In this way it was possible for Mrs. K. to accept and "justify" her husband's behavior, which

otherwise would have created conflict in her mind because of her wish to live with him and yet feeling that she should condemn him. Her wish to live with him and her fondness for him, of course, were associated with her husband's pleasant personality which was ever recurrent. Part of the treatment consisted, therefore, in strengthening the expectation of this recurrency.

Treatment in all cases of the Dual-Roles type does not center so exclusively around attempts to modify the attitudes of the marriage partner toward the disorganized person, as is illustrated in the K. case. Nevertheless, even in those cases where there is little dissociation and rationalization, treatment tends to be less directed toward the disorganized individual himself than is generally true of most types of cases, and especially that type characterized by the escape mechanism.

From the standpoint of social therapy, cases of the Escape-Response type vary widely in terms of the types of escape mechanisms involved and the circumstances under which they are used. The use of illness as an escape mechanism by women results in a different pattern of domestic discord than when used by men. Whereas the "sick" wife's position within the family group is not inferior, the role of the husband who is "ill" is decidedly so. Thus while a woman's complaints of "illness" are looked upon with both skepticism and sympathy, the same complaints by a man are interpreted by the marriage partner as malingering. In addition there is resentment toward the husband's inability to give financial support which often necessitates the wife going to work. In such situations the wife usually assumes more and more the dominant role. The husband is thought of as weak and ineffectual, not only by the wife but also by his children.

In cases where the husband escapes responsibilities through illness, there is found usually also a differentiation of sex impulse, the wife having stronger sex desire than her husband. This factor, along with the general feeling of inferiority and unimportance, often leads to serious sex conflict and in some instances to psychological impotency. This situation only leads to

still further exaggerated complaints of weakness and sickness on the part of the husband in an attempt further to escape the family situation and the undesirable position to which he has descended within the family circle.

Domestic-discord cases in which the husband escapes through illness are almost identical in general pattern with those where drink is used as an escape mechanism by the husband and calls for similar treatment. It is true, of course, that in some cases where drink is used there may be the added complication of keeping the patient sober long enough to enable one to carry out an intensive program of social therapy. In spite of the striking similarity between these two types of cases, however, there is a decided difference in one respect. The absence of frequent desertions and separations in those cases where illness is used as an escape mechanism by the husband stands in sharp contrast to the frequent breakdowns in family unity occurring where drink is used.

Treatment of both of these groups probably can best be illustrated by that carried on in the R. case (Chapter VII), where drink was used as a method of escape. The psychological basis for his drinking was first analyzed to Mr. R. by showing him how this behavior was related to the life pattern. The process is essentially the same as in the general process described earlier in the chapter. In addition the complexity of the situation was stressed and the futility of his attempts at auto-suggestion which the man who drinks is so inclined to use.

Together with this process of interpretation there was an attempt to modify Mr. R.'s position in his family. First there was the sexual relationship with his wife to be considered. Since Mrs. R.'s attitude was responsible for her husband's feeling that his manhood was on trial on every occasion of sexual intercourse, it was necessary to explain this to her and to encourage her to take a more sympathetic attitude, even to the extent of simulating sexual satisfaction. This was done, of course, only after Mrs. R. had been thoroughly instructed in the nature of sex relations and had been given thorough insight into her husband's personality difficulties. Of particular importance in this

process was the explanation of why her husband accused her of infidelity. These accusations, it was explained, grew out of Mr. R.'s impotency and resulted in his feeling that if he was not satisfying her some other man was, thus representing a projection upon her of his feeling of inadequacy.

Another element in the modification of Mr. R.'s position in the family was the approach of the therapist in her contacts with Mr. R. Always he was dealt with as the head of the family, especially in the presence of other members, for the suggestive effect this would have upon their attitudes.

In this type of case it is often well to go rather thoroughly into the industrial adaptation of the individual. This is based upon the assumption that what such an individual needs is some success to counteract his feelings of inadequacy. This often may be accomplished if the therapist is able to find out the extent to which the individual has any particular ability which may be directed into work or recreational channels.

Further need for vocational adjustment grows out of the fact that the kind of work itself often contributes to a feeling of inadequacy as in the case of Mr. R., who had to drink in order to make the successful solicitations which his job as a laundry driver required. Not infrequently a slight shift in vocation or an opportunity for recreational expression of an earlier vocational interest will accomplish the desired results. This is illustrated by the case of a man who, as the social therapist learned, had been quite well adjusted during a period of about three years when he engaged in amateur boxing bouts for which he achieved considerable recognition. It was possible later to revive this interest by having him join a club which encouraged, among other things, competition in boxing in which he still could excel.

Thus in the treatment of cases in which the man escapes through illness or drink, chief emphasis is placed upon changing the attitudes of the members of his family toward him, since his inferiority is largely a reflection of their attitudes. Interpretation of his life process, though it should not be neglected, is of secondary importance, due to the fact that his inferior position in the family cannot be changed by his understanding alone. In

the case of escape through illness on the part of the wife, on the other hand, success in treatment depends to a greater degree perhaps than with any other group, upon the extent to which she accepts the interpretation of her behavior and is enabled thereby to meet situations directly rather than always evading them.

The husband, as in practically all domestic-discord cases, needs to be given understanding of his wife's behavior in order not only to be more tolerant of it but also in order to know how to relate himself to her. As in the O. case (Chapter VI) Mr. O., who was interviewed first, was told that as soon as Mrs. O. was seen by the therapist it would be possible to give him an understanding of the situation so that his wife would no longer be a "puzzle" to him, as he put it. A significant factor in connection with this type of case is the great amount of patience shown on the part of the husband. This patience, however, is not based upon a rational outlook, but rather upon the fear that he may be misjudging his wife after all and she may be a sick woman. For this reason separations and desertions are more infrequent in this group, and the therapist rarely has to deal with emotional outbursts on the part of the husband. However, since his tolerance is emotional rather than intellectual, it is necessary to transfer it to a rational plane.

It is essential also that the husband be consistent in his attitude and at no time treat his wife as a "sick" woman. In order to do this, of course, he must have a clear conception of why she endeavors to play the role of an invalid. In the process of giving insight into the wife's behavior, the factors in the marriage situation which have resulted in the culmination of a crisis out of these earlier trends need to be stressed. In this way the husband is so closely identified with and becomes so much a part of the causal sequence that the therapist is able to dispel that feeling of martyrdom which is so characteristic of the husband of the neurotic woman.

In interpreting the wife's behavior to her husband, however, caution needs to be exercised to insure that he does not get the idea that his wife is deliberately pretending she is ill. The writer

has seen cases where the therapist, either in his haste at giving the husband an explanation, or because of his own superficial analysis of the situation, has furnished the patient only the idea that his wife is a "well woman," thus aggravating the conflict.

In the O. case the husband was shown, through an interpretation of his wife's behavior, how logically her responses had developed both out of her girlhood experiences and those of her marriage. The usualness of her behavior was stressed, viz., that probably no one placed in the same situation with similar experiences would have behaved differently. He was shown in general how every individual's ideas are molded by early experiences and specifically the genesis of his wife's attitudes. During this process he was told that he also, like his wife or anyone else, is different because of certain experiences. At this point he volunteered the information, "I had never thought of it before, but the fact that my parents were so old when I was born has had an effect on me. The fact that I slept with my parents so long must have influenced me too." Thus Mr. O. indicated his acceptance of the interpretation. Later he gave further evidence of identifying himself with this interpretation to the extent of saying, "I guess I have made a mistake. I was always too cautious in sex relations. I had read books and I guess I followed the books too closely. Neither one of us understood."

Care was used also in instructing Mr. O. never to indicate by his attitude that he regarded his wife as a sick woman. His insistence upon her seeing physicians, his references to her "sickness"—such as, "She can't do that; that is her sickness,"—should cease. On the other hand, he was cautioned against impatience and such remarks as, "You aren't sick; you just imagine it."

It was possible to get Mrs. O. to accept the interpretation of her behavior through the processes we have already described. The purpose was to get her to take a more objective point of view by showing her the self-deception involved. The reason why she refused to ride on streetcars alone was frankly given her. After she had recounted her early attachment to her family, her "little sister" role, etc., instead of categorically characterizing her behavior as infantile, she was shown how her insistence upon

being taken everywhere by her husband or some other person was similar to "being wheeled in a baby carriage." Once her refusal to ride on streetcars alone—or in fact to go anywhere alone—was analyzed to her, it no longer had the charm which it previously had, since it was neither unique nor mysterious.

Likewise, once Mr. O. understood his wife's behavior, he met certain situations quite differently than he had previously. For example, where he had once remained at home because of his wife's "spells," he now went alone if she refused to accompany him. As a result she began going with him. Whereas when formerly on the rare occasions she had attended a cinema with him, he had left the theater when she pulled at his clothing and insisted that she was too ill to remain, he now ignored her complaints.

Instruction in the use of contraceptives, in the physiology of the sex act, etc., was given by the sex hygienist. It was necessary for the social therapist, however, to show the husband how logically sex response had grown more and more important as a form of attention and how, because of Mrs. O.'s unsatisfied sex desires, she became jealous of her husband's attention to the children. Furthermore, because of her craving for attention which she did not receive, her desire for sexual response only became intensified. This craving for attention was shown in its relation to the life pattern. Thus, through correlating it with the life pattern and the sex conflict, it was given a rational setting in the larger complex of personality disorganization.

While a certain amount of phantasy is present in those cases where illness is used as an escape by the woman, it seldom takes any form other than that of daydreaming through glorifying the past when there was a "lover" who would have been more romantic than the husband and with whom married life would have been more ideal. This type of phantasy, however, is harmless, as there is no attempt to realize the phantasy role in overt behavior. On the other hand, consistent attempts to act out the phantasy role are likely to result in anti-social behavior, since it is only through subterfuge that the individual can realize the superior role. This behavior complicates marriage

relations as in the case of Mr. P. (Chapter VIII), who in his phantasying failed to take his wife into account, identifying her with the inferior role from which he was trying to escape.

The Phantasy and the Dual-Roles types have some elements in common in that both frequently lead to antisocial behavior. Both are characterized by the fact that the man usually poses as a single man often to the extent of consummating a second marriage. In the Phantasy type, however, there is not the alternation of equally important roles, since the phantasy role is always in the foreground, almost to the exclusion of the inferior role, or real role, from which the individual is trying to escape. Treatment of this type of case is more difficult than it is with some other types—the escape-response through illness, for example—because of the greater number of contacts. Thus the typical individual in cases of this kind has a wide variety of social contacts, many of which tend to be secondary. Treatment, therefore, is less successful because of the difficulties involved in controlling the environmental pressures represented in the wide range of contacts.

Escape through phantasy, on the other hand, has more in common with the use of drink as an escape mechanism than illness in that where drink and phantasy are used the individual is able to feel important through the use of these escape mechanisms, whereas illness leads only to feelings of further inferiority. From the standpoint of treatment it is necessary among other things for the therapist to find out, as in the case of drink, if the individual has any particular ability which may be directed into work or recreational channels. In the case of Mr. P., for example, who has always wanted to be a typesetter, it is essential to know whether or not he has the ability to do this kind of work, either on the basis of his present training or through a short period of instruction.

Self-deception is present to a larger degree where there is escape through phantasy and illness as compared to escape through drink. Treatment of the Phantasy type, like that of escape through illness, involves getting at this self-deception by showing the individual how his conception of himself has no

basis in fact but represents a consistent attempt to realize a role for which he has little or no qualification. As in the case of Mr. P., the reason why he posed as a clubman, a single man, an exceptional salesman, etc., was interpreted to him as a consistent pattern of escape. He was also shown how in reality he was playing an "infantile" role, instead of the "superior" role he would like to think of himself as playing. Thus in the treatment of this type of case there is a more complete deflation of the ego than in any other. This is followed up by just enough explanation of the normality of the individual's behavior to prevent him from feeling that the attitude of the therapist is subjective. Further assurance of the therapist's objectivity is given through a program designed to discover the patient's capabilities and to make possible their realization.

Sexual conflict in the Phantasy type takes quite a different form from that of the other Escape-Response types. The marriage partner who uses escape through phantasy usually does not have an inferior position in his immediate family as does the person who escapes through drink. In fact, his ability to move in a higher social world than does his marriage partner, his aloofness, etc., while irritating to the other person, nevertheless gives him a certain glamour in that person's eyes. Sexual conflict, therefore, takes the form of complaints of sexual indifference and neglect against the marriage partner who poses as single and who is suspected of having extra-marital relations. To the extent that the couple have sexual relations there is often, of course, the usual amount of sexual antagonism growing out of fear of pregnancy and lack of sex knowledge, but this is secondary to the conflict developing out of indifference and neglect.

Treatment of the sex conflict in phantasy cases, accordingly, is little different from that in other situations where the one person feels that his marriage partner is indifferent toward him. It is essential that the former be given thorough understanding of the sex conflict in the light of the larger conflict pattern. In cases where the phantasy pattern is not too securely entrenched, treatment of the cultural and economic factors will greatly modify the sex conflict. In cases where there is little possibility

of modification of the phantasy pattern it is necessary to give the marriage partner a clear conception of the phantasy mechanism and the degree of adjustment which can be anticipated. Whether this leads to tolerance, with some degree of satisfaction, or to separation depends upon the wishes of the marriage partner. Not infrequently, in fact, he is not inclined toward separation, as is indicated by the intense jealousy found in these cases.

With those cases where the domestic discord may be said to grow out of the personality disorganization of the individual, treatment, as has been seen, is carried on with the background of the personality pattern in mind. The social therapist is always working on the assumption that the pattern of domestic discord is inextricably interwoven with the life pattern. Any treatment, therefore, must be directed primarily toward the modification of the basic personality pattern. This does not mean that the marriage situation is neglected but only that this phase of the problem is of secondary importance. In that group of cases in which conflict arises out of the marriage these latter elements become of primary importance in the treatment process, though obviously the backgrounds of the individuals have to be taken into account.

The utilization of background materials in this latter group of cases, however, differs from that in which personality disorganization is present prior to marriage. In the second group it is necessary in the analytical process to go into the backgrounds of the individuals just as thoroughly as in the first group. In other words, it is only by doing so that one can determine whether or not there are constant mechanisms which hinder adjustment. Once this has been done and the persons seem organized, then variations in the life patterns of this group are regarded as secondary to conflict patterns. Treatment, therefore, becomes primarily a matter of redefining those situations in which conflict arises.

Redefinition of the situation, however, consists in relieving the stresses and strains which are common to all marriages. There are few marriages in which the individuals have identical

backgrounds. Conflict in attitudes is therefore inevitable. Yet while there is conflict in many marriages, the individuals are able to work out their own adjustments. The task of the social therapist, accordingly, is to facilitate this process of adjustment which goes on unaided in some cases but is either delayed or impeded in others. Thus sexual adjustment, harmonious response relations, and cultural identification are the results of accommodation, into which conflict inevitably enters. Many events occur which halt or block the process of accommodation. It is at this point that the social therapist enters in an effort to break down the barriers and to facilitate what may be thought of as the normal tendency toward accommodation.

Treatment of these conflict patterns is similar to that in those already discussed except in point of emphasis. Thus the origin of conflict is explained to the individuals in order to give them a less emotional point of view. This is of particular importance, since this group of cases is characterized by sudden and explosive outbursts on the part of the individuals concerned. Once the true nature of the conflict elements is made clear, there is no cause for blame in the situation. This first phase of the treatment process is concerned, accordingly, with orienting the individuals in terms of certain common attributes of human nature. Once this has been accomplished, the social therapist endeavors to carry over this understanding of human nature in general to an intellectual appreciation of the way in which conflict has developed out of interaction between the two persons.

A further variation in emphasis grows out of the fact that it is not as imperative to co-ordinate so highly the specialized services with the general treatment process. Although such co-ordination is highly desirable in many instances, the patients themselves may be depended upon to work out this unification to a larger extent than when there is disorganization of personality.

Thus treatment in those cases in which domestic discord develops out of the marriage situation does not call for the use of any techniques other than those already described in connection with those cases in which personality disorganization

constitutes the basic factor. Whatever differences need to be taken into account between these two types of cases grow out of variations in emphasis upon the two major techniques, the re-interpretation of behavior and the redefinition of situations.

Up to this point treatment has been discussed in terms of the processes by which attitudes are modified. There is implied in what has preceded that treatment is, of course, always consistently in some direction or other. What determines this direction is an important part of the treatment process, and raises the question: Should there be in every case an attempt to re-establish unity in the family?

Attempts to re-establish unity in the family depend inevitably upon the wishes of the persons concerned. The role of the social therapist is to analyze the situation and point out what treatment procedures may be followed. The social therapist has nothing to gain by telling two people that they should or should not live together. All he can do is to point out the factors in the situation which have made for conflict and toward which therapy may be directed. The decision as to whether they prefer to work toward resumption of the marriage relationship is necessarily up to the persons themselves. Unfortunately the social therapist in the past has been too ready to recommend that two people should or should not live together, basing his decision upon his own personal feelings in the situation—"I could not live with such a man;" or, "What can that man get out of life with a woman like that?"

The task of the social therapist, accordingly, is to help the individuals concerned to realize what they *already* wish without telling them what they *should* wish. It has been the writer's experience that most of the people in the group studied wanted to live together, as indicated first by slight gestures and later by frank statements. At least half of the group were separated, however, at the time the first interviews were held. In the larger number of cases no reference was made directly by the therapist as to re-establishment of family unity. The assumption here was that after the situation has been analyzed objectively and after the individuals have been able to relate

themselves unemotionally to it, they are able to decide what they wish. Furthermore the interview tends to re-establish whatever unity there has been, owing to the fact that the present conflict situation is brought into a perspective in which memory has tended to accentuate the pleasant as over against the unpleasant experiences.¹

On the surface, indecision may characterize the wishes of the individuals concerned. Since the interview is directed toward obtaining perspective instead of focusing on the immediate situation, the wishes become more clearly defined. Occasionally, however, it is necessary for the social therapist to raise the question of what the persons will do if they do not continue to live together in order to facilitate the individual's making up his own mind.

There are, of course, cases in which one or both the individuals do not want to work out an adjustment of their conflict, but prefer instead to separate. Even where both are in equal agreement in this regard, there is often much which the social therapist can do to help bridge over the gap from marriage relations to those of a single person. But where one person shows considerable disorganization of personality as the result of domestic discord, it is essential that the social therapist treat the personality problem. This can be done through giving the individual insight and, where there are children, strengthening the bond between parent and children if there is any need for therapy in this direction.

While the wishes of the persons determine the goal of social therapy, the procedure in testing change in attitudes is always an indirect one, in which covert elements are more important than overt. In measuring change in any particular case, the therapist must keep in mind the extent to which modification of attitudes has been consistent with the treatment; that is, is it the sort of change which would be anticipated by the treatment process? Any change, therefore, which is not consistent with the treatment would be viewed skeptically by the therapist.

¹During the period of treatment there were no desertions after the first interview, in spite of the fact that many cases had shown a history of frequent desertions.

Take, for example, the case of a man who has a daughter by a previous marriage of whom he is very fond. Conflict with his present wife has been accentuated by his preference for his daughter, expressed by his sleeping with her rather than with his wife. After a period of time, greater accord may on the surface seem to exist between the husband and wife resulting from treatment of the sex conflict and the mental conflict of the husband in having remarried. This accord, however, would be looked upon with skepticism if it were found that the husband, in spite of his insistence of the existence of greater harmony and understanding, still continued to sleep with his daughter. The therapist would, therefore, decide that there had been no fundamental modification of attitudes.

In evaluating change it is necessary for the therapist to keep in mind also the extent to which any modifications are consistent with what is known of the general principles of human nature. It is generally known, for example, that attitudes do not change abruptly. Any evidence of sudden transformations in human nature should therefore be carefully scrutinized. Modifications in attitudes are not suddenly achieved, as many individuals would like to think. It is usually necessary to impress this upon the patient in order that he will not become too optimistic and feel that his problems are disappearing like magic and therefore do not require a long-time program of social therapy. This, likewise, needs to be impressed upon social therapists, for many are too likely, in their enthusiasm for indications of change, to accept superficial evidence of change in the direction toward which they have been working. It is so easy for the therapist unconsciously to read into his work what he would like to exist, particularly if he lacks objectivity. Checks and safeguards are necessary, therefore, against the enthusiasms and biases of the social therapist.

It is true, of course, that in some instances the therapist may get cues of change from overt behavior. However, these cues can only be regarded as significant where there has been no direct attempt to call out a direct overt response. Otherwise overt responses are misleading. Suppose, for example, that a hus-

band who has been away from his wife several months is interviewed by the therapist. No direct attempt whatever is made to get him to return home or to assume any responsibility to his family. If, however, he returns home and shows evidence of desiring to resume the husband role, the therapist may assume some modification in the attitudes of the husband relative to his family situation.

But while indications of change may be observed from time to time by the social therapist, it is only after a thoroughgoing inventory has been taken that he can be sure of the extent to which there has been adjustment of the conflict. This inventory consists of reviewing the analysis in detail and checking each element to determine what change has taken place within that segment. If, for example, there has been sex conflict, then a careful check must be made upon the sexual relationship at the present time, comparing this with the situation at the time of the first interview. If domestic discord has developed out of personality disorganization, it is necessary to determine the extent to which there has been modification of the life pattern, as well as of the attitudes of the other person, in such a way as to bring about greater accord.

A case of domestic discord, therefore, cannot be judged as having yielded to treatment until as careful an analysis is made of the present situation as was obtained at the initial contact. When this latter analysis shows changes in the marital situation in the direction of accord consistent with the treatment process, the treatment may be assumed to have been successful.

It is necessary, of course, that sufficient time elapse between the beginning and the end of the treatment process. The length of this period varies for different types of cases but would ordinarily not be less than two years. Furthermore, no credence should be placed in statements of the persons themselves without careful check upon their attitudes, to be sure that these do not represent wish projections or grow out of the enthusiasm of the moment.

While it is conceivable that the goal of treatment might be set too high, this is not likely. It is essential, however, that the

social therapist have some idea of what constitutes a normal amount of accord in family relations. In the same way the goal of treatment of personality disorganization needs to be defined in relative terms, recognizing that in adjusted personalities there is some conflict.

One may characterize a case of domestic discord as adjusted, accordingly, when the inventory process shows that the situation has changed from what was found at the initial interview to one in which there is accord to the extent that neither of the persons considers the possibility of separation or divorce and that both indicate faith in the present marriage relationship. This does not imply that a crisis in their relations cannot arise at some future time any more than that a person's having been cured of one physical ailment precludes his contracting another. The essential feature of complete adjustment is that, whereas at the beginning of the treatment the whole trend of marital relations was toward abandonment of the family unity, now the trend is quite as conclusively toward continuing the relationship upon a mutually satisfactory basis.

If, on the other hand, the inventory reveals changes in the direction of accord, but also a certain amount of skepticism at times, even though the situation has changed to the extent of the couple living together, where they had previously been separated, the treatment would be judged partially successful. Thus in partial adjustment there might be highly satisfactory adjustment in some realms of relations where previously there had been considerable conflict, and yet the case be judged partially adjusted because of little or no substantial changes in other realms.

In some cases, no doubt, this differentiation of partial from complete adjustment may not be entirely justified, since the family situation may be of such a character that what has been defined as partial adjustment is all that could possibly be hoped for. The therapist finds himself in this regard in a situation somewhat analogous to that of the physician in the treatment of that large group of cases commonly called heart ailments. The physician may do much for the patient by prescribing a

regimen which eliminates excessive strain upon the heart and thus facilitates building up compensation, but that does not give the patient a new heart though he can lead a fairly normal life. In the same way much may be done to eliminate the discord between husband and wife, and yet at times either marriage partner may take a skeptical attitude toward his marriage. Thus a wife may say, "My husband is not the man I would like him to be but now I see him in a different light, and I am satisfied if he stays as good as he is at present."

By applying the tests of outcome, the social therapist is able to evaluate experimentally not only the treatment process itself, but the analysis which preceded. In so doing he has completed the cycle of the clinical approach to domestic discord.

Two general processes of treatment have been emphasized because these seem basic. Further clinical studies will need to be made to determine whether there are other processes which can be differentiated, and to work out in greater detail the possible variations in the processes described. In the same way further research will undoubtedly result in the discovery of new types of life patterns and of domestic-discard patterns, as well as of variations in the patterns presented. Thus the results of the clinical approach should make for a more effective analysis and treatment of personality disorganization and of domestic discord.

A STATISTICAL POSTSCRIPT

Statistical findings relative to outcome should be based upon a sufficiently large number of cases to preclude the operation of chance before great confidence can be placed upon such findings. The following tables, therefore, are presented for what they are worth in terms of the limited number of cases involved.

Treatment of the first group, one hundred and twenty cases, over a period of two to four years according to the procedure described in these pages resulted as follows:¹

TABLE I

Outcome in Relation to First Contact	Follow-up Treatment ²	
	Intensive	Little or none
Separated at First Contact:		
Divorced or continued separation	3	8
Living together, otherwise no adjustment	3	1
Partial adjustment	19	—
Complete adjustment	32	—
Living together at First Contact:		
Divorced or separated	1	—
Living together, otherwise no adjustment	1	1
Partial adjustment	13	—
Complete adjustment	38	—

That this group of cases covers fairly adequately the range of types described may be seen from the following table:

TABLE II

Outcome	Types of Domestic Discord			
	Personality Disorganization			No Personality Disorganization ³
	Conflicting Roles	Dual Roles	Escape-Response (All types)	
Divorced or continued separation	—	1	3	8
Living together, otherwise no adjustment	—	1	2	3
Partial adjustment	3	2	17	10
Complete adjustment	11	8	30	21

¹ For a description of the conditions under which treatment was carried out, and certain social characteristics of this group of cases, see Author's Preface.

² Intensive follow-up treatment means frequent contacts over a period of at least two years in which all the treatment contacts were consistent with the recommendations. In all other cases follow-up treatment was characterized as "little or none."

³ In the eight cases in which the outcome was "divorced or continued separation," the couples were separated at first contact and there was no intensive follow-up treatment. (See Table I.)

Perhaps the most striking feature of these findings is the relatively uniform proportion of complete adjustments irrespective of the type of domestic discord. But since there are some variations, and the number of cases is small, it would seem that these results taken tentatively are suggestive of what may be expected of the treatment technique described.

One might expect, nevertheless, some variation in the degree of success which could be attained in the treatment of the several types of unadjusted personalities. In fact, it has already been pointed out that the type in which there are dual roles does not lend itself to treatment as well as escape response through illness. But since there are two persons to each marriage and the probabilities that both will present the same personality difficulty are slight, successful treatment is not dependent exclusively upon the degree to which a particular type of personality disorganization will yield to therapy. In fact, the situation is even more simple since it is rather rare to find both persons showing evidence of personality disorganization. In the treatment of the domestic discord, accordingly, more drastic changes in the attitudes of one of the marriage partners may compensate for slight changes in the attitudes of the other.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHIES

I. THE FAMILY

- Bosanquet, Helen. *The Family* (New York and London, 1906).
- Calhoun, Arthur W. *A Social History of the American Family from Colonial Times to the Present* (3 vols.; Cleveland, 1917-19).
- Davis, Katharine B. *Factors in the Sex Life of Twenty-two Hundred Women* (New York, 1929).
- Ellis, Havelock. *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (6 vols.; Philadelphia, 1900, 1901, 1903, 1905, 1906, 1910, 1913 and 1915).
- Elmer, M. C. *Family Adjustment and Social Change* (New York, 1932).
- Flügel, J. C. *The Psycho-Analytic Study of the Family* (London, 1921).
- Folsom, J. K. *The Family* (New York, 1934).
- Goodsell, Willystine. *A History of Marriage and the Family* (Rev. ed.; New York, 1934).
- Groves, E. R. *The American Family* (Philadelphia, 1934).
- . *Marriage* (New York, 1933).
- and Lee M. Brooks. *Readings in the Family* (Philadelphia, 1934).
- and William F. Ogburn. *American Marriage and Family Relationships* (New York, 1928).
- Howard, George E. *A History of Matrimonial Institutions* (3 vols.; Chicago, 1904).
- Lindquist, Ruth. *The Family in the Present Social Order* (Chapel Hill, 1931).
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Sex and Repression in Savage Society* (London and New York, 1927).
- Mower, Ernest R. *The Family* (Chicago, 1932).
- Nimkoff, M. F. *The Family* (Boston, 1934).
- Ogburn, William F. "The Family and Its Functions," *Recent Social Trends*, Vol. I (New York, 1933).
- Reed, Ruth. *The Modern Family* (New York, 1929).
- Reuter, E. B., and Jessie R. Runner. *The Family* (New York, 1931).

- Schmiedeler, Edgar. *An Introductory Study of the Family* (New York, 1930).
- Spencer, Anna Garlin. *The Family and Its Members* (Philadelphia, 1923).
- Thomas, W. I. *Sex and Society* (Chicago, 1907).
- and Florian Znaniecki. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (2 vols.; New York, 1927).
- Velde, Th. H. van de. *Ideal Marriage* (New York, 1930).
- Westermarck, Edward. *The History of Human Marriage* (3 vols.; New York, 1891 and 1921).

II. PERSONALITY

- Adler, Alfred. *The Neurotic Constitution* (trans.; New York, 1917).
- . *The Practice and Theory of Individual Psychology* (Rev. ed.; New York, 1929).
- Bagby, English. *The Psychology of Personality* (New York, 1928).
- Bernard, L. L. *An Introduction to Social Psychology* (New York, 1926).
- Burgess, E. W. (ed.) *Personality and the Social Group* (Chicago, 1929).
- Cooley, Charles H. *Human Nature and the Social Order* (New York, 1902, 1922).
- Dewey, John. *Human Nature and Conduct* (New York, 1922).
- Folsom, Joseph K. *Social Psychology* (New York, 1931).
- Freud, Sigmund A. *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis* (New York, 1920).
- Groves, E. R. *Personality and Social Adjustment* (New York, 1923).
- Hart, Bernard. *The Psychology of Insanity* (London, 1920).
- Healy, William. *Mental Conflicts and Misconduct* (Boston, 1917).
- , Augusta Bronner and Anna M. Bowers. *The Structure and Meaning of Psychoanalysis* (New York, 1930).
- Janet, Pierre. *Principles of Psychotherapy* (trans.; New York, 1924).
- . *Psychological Healing* (trans.; New York, 1925).
- Jung, Carl G. *Psychological Types* (New York, 1924).
- Karpf, Fay B. *American Social Psychology* (New York, 1932).
- Krueger, E. T. and W. C. Reckless. *Social Psychology* (New York, 1931).
- Mead, George H. *Mind, Self, and Society* (Chicago, 1934).
- Murphy, Gardner and Lois B. Murphy. *Experimental Social Psychology* (New York, 1931).
- Myerson, Abraham. *The Foundations of Personality* (Boston, 1921).
- Roback, A. A. *A Bibliography of Character and Personality* (Cambridge, 1927).

- Shand, A. F. *The Foundations of Character* (London, 1914).
Sprowls, J. W. *Social Psychology Interpreted* (Baltimore, 1927).
Thomas, W. I. *The Unadjusted Girl* (Boston, 1923).
White, W. A. *Mechanisms of Character Formation* (New York, 1916).
Young, Kimball. *Social Psychology* (New York, 1930).
——— (ed.) *Social Attitudes* (New York, 1931).

III. DOMESTIC DISCORD

- Cahen, A. *Statistical Analysis of American Divorce* (New York, 1932).
Colcord, Joanna C. *Broken Homes* (New York, 1919).
Dickinson, Robert L. and Lura Beam. *A Thousand Marriages* (Baltimore, 1931).
Eubank, Earl E. *A Study of Family Desertion* (Chicago, 1916).
Hamilton, G. V. *A Research in Marriage* (New York, 1929).
Lichtenberger, James P. *Divorce* (New York, 1931).
Mowrer, Ernest R. *Family Disorganization* (Chicago, 1927).
——— and Harriet R. Mowrer. *Domestic Discord* (Chicago, 1928).
Myerson, Abraham. *The Nervous Housewife* (Boston, 1920).
Waller, Willard. *The Old Love and the New* (New York, 1930).

IV. METHODOLOGY

- Bernard, L. L. (ed.) *The Fields and Methods of Sociology* (New York, 1934).
Bingham, Walter V., and Bruce V. Moore. *How to Interview* (New York, 1931).
Bogardus, Emory S. *Contemporary Sociology* (Los Angeles, 1931).
Chapin, F. S. *Field Work and Social Research* (New York, 1920).
Columbia Associates in Philosophy. *An Introduction to Reflective Thinking* (Boston, 1923).
Cooley, C. H. *Sociological Theory and Social Research* (New York, 1930).
Hobson, E. W. *The Domain of Natural Science* (Cambridge, 1923).
Lundberg, George A. *Social Research* (New York, 1929).
Park, Robert E., and E. W. Burgess. *An Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago, 1921).
Pearson, Karl. *The Grammar of Science* (London, 1900 and 1911).
Rice, Stuart A. (ed.) *Methods in Social Science* (Chicago, 1931).
Richmond, Mary E. *Social Diagnosis* (New York, 1917).
Taft, Jessie. *The Dynamics of Therapy* (New York, 1933).
Thomas, W. I. and Dorothy S. Thomas. *The Child in America* (New York, 1928).
Webb, Sidney and Beatrice. *Methods of Social Study* (London, 1932).

•

INDEX

- culty in getting at, 220, as consistent with adjustment, 51; in culture, 58; dissociation, as a solution of, 69; in dual-roles type, 71; forms of solution to, 68, 69; in groups, 51; with in-laws, 171-178; long duration of, and therapy, 247-248; mental, and abortion, 155; mental, in the immigrant, 201-205; necessity for understanding covert phases of, 219-220; and personality, 51; in points of view of scientist and humanist, 3; rationalization as a mechanism for dissolving, 70; repression as non-rational solution to, 69; in response relations, 170-190; between roles, 50, 51-69; in selves, 51, 67-69; in sex relations, 59, 91, 92, 106, 113, 123, 132, 149-169.
- Conflicting roles, analysis of case of, 66-68; case of, 52-68; contrasted with dual-roles type, 71; treatment of, 253-255; treatment of, contrasted with dual-roles, 255; as type of domestic discord, 50, 51-69; as type of unadjusted personality, 50.
- Contraceptives, instruction in use of, 249.
- Contraceptive measures, little used, 155.
- Control technique, illness as, 88-108; sex relations as, 153-154.
- Conventions, divergence in, 193-198.
- COOLEY, CHARLES H., cited, 51.
- Covert processes, difficulty in getting at, 220; necessity for understanding, 219-220; neglect of, 220-221.
- Culture: as determining sex behavior, xi, xiii, 191; Jewish *vs.* Persian, 193-198; and personality differences, vii-ix.
- Cultural conflict, analysis of, in conflicting-roles type, 68; analysis of, in dual-roles type, 86; arising out of husband's emigration, 199-205; as basis for rationalization of other conflicts, 212; as differentiated from response, 190; and domestic discord, 191-212; in intermarriage, 192; and rationalization, 208; relation of, to response conflict, 190; as symbolic of other conflicts, 212; as symbolic of response conflict, 219.
- Cultural-conflict pattern, differentiated from response-conflict pattern, 190; as form of domestic discord, 191-212.
- Cultural differences, analysis of, 211-212; arising subsequent to marriage, 198-206; as basic element in personality, 205-206; as basis of rationalization, 208; in cases of immigration, 199-205; emotional setting of, 192; illustration of, 208-210; and intermarriage, 193-198; in intermarriage, 192; minimized in American culture, 191; as rationalizations, 191; as rationalization of economic and response conflicts, 208; symbolic character of conflict in, 192.
- Cultural factors, in case of conflicting-roles, 57, 59; in case of drink, 117, 118-119; in case of dual roles, 75, 77; in case of illness as escape mechanism, 96, 97-98; in case of phantasy, 135-136, 137; in case of response conflict, 180-181, 182; questions upon, 19-20, 21; in V. case, 225, 227.
- Cultural patterns, in case of conflicting roles, 55-56; in case of drink, 115; in case of dual roles, 73-74; in case of illness as escape mechanism, 94-95; in case of phantasy, 134; in case of response conflict, 179; questions upon, 19; in V. case, 223.

D

- Daughter-in-law, conflict with, 172-174.
- DAVIS, KATHARINE B., cited, 6, 7 n.; method of, 6-7.
- Daydreaming, as form of phantasy, 126.
- Desertions, absence of, after first interview, 267 n.; absence of, in cases of illness, 92; as escape mechanism, 113; frequency of, in cases of drink, 113; symbolic meaning of, 221.
- DICKINSON, ROBERT L., and BEAM, cited, 8; method of, 8.
- Disillusionment, and the immigrant, 200.
- Displacement, in the interview, 247.
- Dissociation, description of, 70; as non-rational solution to conflict, 69; presence of, in dual-roles type, 255; and rationalization, 70; and type of

- domestic discord, 69; and type of unadjusted life pattern, 69.
- Domestic discord, analysis of case of,** 105-107, 122-124, 143-145; analytical problem in case of, 221-238; case of conflicting roles, 52-68; case of drink, 114-122; case of illness, 93-105; case of phantasy, 132-143; characterization of phantasy type of, 132-133; the child and, 128; classification of, 50; and clinical interview, 12-31; conflicting-roles type of, 50, 51-69; and cultural conflict, 191-212; defined, 52; drink as type of, 109-124; dual roles contrasted with conflicting roles, 71; dual-roles type of, 70-87; dual-roles type of, defined, 71; genesis of, in personality, 5, 36, 44, 52; illness as type of, 88-108; and methodology, 3; as part of larger conflict pattern, 52; and personality disorganization, xxiii; phantasy type of, 125-145; process conception of, 216-217; and role of child in family, 40-41; sequence conception of, 216-219; and sex conflict, 149-169; as viewed by humanist, 3; as viewed by scientist, 3-4.
- Domestic-discord patterns, analysis of case of,** 122-124, 143-145; analysis of illness, 105-107; case of drink, 114-122; case of illness, 93-105; case of phantasy, 132-143; classified, 50; conflicting-roles type, 50, 51-69; cultural conflict as form of, 191-212; determined in marriage, 149-212; response conflict as form of, 170-190; drink as type of, 88-108; dual-roles type, 70-87; dual roles contrasted with conflicting roles, 71; illness as type of, 88-108; phantasy as type of, 132-143; response conflict as form of, 170-190; treatment of, 239-274; and unadjusted personalities, 50.
- Dress, differences in, and cultural conflict,** 192.
- Drink, analysis of case of,** 122-124; case of, 114-122; more commonly used by men, 111; as complicating marriage relations, 112-114; cures, 109; and desertions and separations, 113; and economic conflict, 112; effect of, upon personality, 110-111; as escape mechanism, 50, 109-124; and family conflict, 112-113; as means of reinstating earlier role, 111; physiological effects of, 109; and release from repression, 110; and sex conflict, 113, 123; as symptom of personality maladjustment, 109; traditional attitude toward, 109; treatment of, 257-259; as type of escape mechanism, 50; as an unsatisfactory escape, 111-112; use of, and other escape mechanisms, 111; use of, to overcome inferiority, 110.
- Drink cures,** 109.
- Drunkenness, as symbolic of personality conflict,** 219. *See also* Drink.
- Dual roles, analysis of,** 84-87; case of, 71-84; contrasted with conflicting roles, 71; defined, 71; treatment of, 255-256; treatment of, contrasted with conflicting roles, 255; as type of domestic discord, 50, 70-87; as type of unadjusted personality, 50, 70-87.

E

- Economic conflict, in cases of drink,** 112; and phantasy, 132; as rationalized cultural conflict, 208; as symbolic of sex conflict, 219.
- Economic factors, in case of conflicting roles,** 56-57, 58; in case of drink, 115-116, 117-118; in case of dual roles, 74-75, 76; in case of illness as escape mechanism, 95, 96; in case of phantasy, 134-135, 136; in case of response conflict, 180, 181; questions upon, 19, 20; in V. case, 224, 225-226.
- Education, differences in, and cultural conflict,** 192.
- Emigration, as source of cultural conflict,** 198-205.
- Escape mechanisms, contrast in use of,** by men and women, 107-108; drink, 50, 89, 109-124; drink as complicating marriage relations, 112-114, 122-124; drink as unsatisfactory, 111-112; illness, 50, 88-108; origin in illness, 90; origin of phantasy as, 127; phantasy, 50, 89, 125-145; treatment of illness as, 251-257,

- 259-262; types of, compared and contrasted, 256-264; used with drink, 111.
- Escape-response pattern, analysis of case, 105-107; case of, 93-105; illness as form of, 88-108; origin of, 90; treatment of drink as form of, 257-259; treatment of illness as form of, 259-261; treatment, and types of mechanisms used in, 256, as type of domestic discord, 50, 88-108; as type of unadjusted personality, 50.
- Ethical standards, relation of, to philosophy of life, 205-206.
- Extra-marital relations, in case of escape response, 92; effect where sanctioned by wife, 151; and the immigrant, 199; as indication of sexual dissatisfaction, 156; and jealousy, 156; and symbolization, 162-166.
- ### F
- Factors in adjustment and conflict between family and community, in case of conflicting roles, 56-58, in case of drink, 115-117; in case of dual roles, 74-76, in case of illness as escape mechanism, 95-96, in case of phantasy, 134-136; in case of response conflict, 180; questions upon, 19-20; in V. case, 224-225.
- Factors in adjustment and conflict within family group, in case of conflicting roles, 58-59; in case of drink, 117-119; in case of dual roles, 76-77; in case of illness as escape mechanism, 96-98; in case of phantasy, 136-137; in case of response conflict, 181-182; questions upon, 20-21; in V. case, 225-226.
- Family, the, conflict arising out of, and non-family contacts, 51; early definition, given to child in, 51; illustrated in conflicting-roles type, 66; origin of phantasy in, 127-131; and role, 37-44.
- Family conflict, in cases of drink, 112-113; in V. case, 221-238.
- Family organization, in case of conflicting roles, 54-55; in case of drink, 114-115; in case of dual roles, 72-73; in case of illness as escape mechanism, 93-94; in case of phantasy, 133; in case of response conflict, 178-179; questions upon, 18, in V. case, 222-223.
- Fellatio*, fear of, when used, 156; in preventing conception, 155-156.
- Filio-parental relationships; *see* Parent-child relationships.
- Folkways, differences in, arising after marriage, 198-206; differences in, and cultural conflict, 192, 193-198.
- Food habits, differences in, and cultural conflict, 192, 197.
- ### H
- HAMILTON, G. V., cited, 7, 7 n.; method of, 7-10.
- Health factors, in case of conflicting roles, 57, 58; in case of drink, 116, 118; in case of dual roles, 75, 76; in case of illness as escape mechanism, 95-96, 96-97; in case of phantasy, 135, 136-137; in case of response conflict, 180, 182; questions upon, 19, 20; in V. case, 224, 226.
- Humanist, approach of, 3-4.
- ### I
- Idealization, and phantasy, 126.
- Ideals, divergence in, 193-198.
- Identification, illustrated, 243-246; of patient with analysis, 243; in response conflict, 177, 189.
- Illness, as escape mechanism, 50; form of, 89; origin of, as escape mechanism, 90, and sex conflict in escape response, 92; as symbolic of personality conflict, 219; treatment of, 259-261, as type of escape response, 50, 88-108; used by men, 107; as used by women, contrasted with men, 256-257.
- Immigrant, the, adjustment of, 199-205; disillusionment of, 200; personal disorganization of, 201-205.
- Impotency, and drink, 113, 123; physical, 159; psychological, 159, 256-257.
- Incestuous relationship, arising out of separations through emigration, 201.

- Inferiority, and compensation, 159 n.; illustrated in case of phantasy, 132-144; and phantasy, 127, 128; and sexual deficiencies, 159-162; and symbolization, 167-168.
- In-laws, as factor in response conflict, 170-178; position of, in family, 171; source of conflict with, 171. *See also* Response conflict.
- Interaction, process of, in treatment, 246.
- Interests, differences in, and response conflict, 178-188, 208-212.
- Intermarriage, case of, and cultural conflict, 193-198; and cultural conflict, 192.
- Interpretation of situation, by analyst, 243, illustrated, 243-246; objective nature of, 247-248; by patient, 242; patient aided in, by analyst, 243-246.
- Interview, the, approach to, 14-17; assumption of, 11; breaking down resistance in, 24; catharsis in, 246-247; chronological sequence as advantageous in treatment, 26; conceptual background of, 13; control in, 26; counteracting patient's tendency to forge ahead in, 26, displacement in, 247; devices used in, 21-23; external check in, 22; function of outline, 13-14; general approach illustrated, 15-17; indirect method of questioning, 23; initial, 13; initiation of treatment in, 30-31; interpretation to patient in, 30-31; method of Dickinson and Beam, 8; method of Hamilton, 7-8, modification of attitudes in, 30; necessity for analysis in, 17-18, necessity for reiteration in, 248; note-taking in, 14-15; obtaining of sex data in, 27-29; objectivity in, 247; outline in, 17-22; phrasing of questions, 23-24, 28-29; place of, 12-13; purpose of, 12; purpose of outline in, 18; purpose of, in treatment, 242; result of, 246-249; sequence followed, 24-31; termination of, 29-31; transference used in, 25; use of prediction in, 219-220; verbatim account of, 14-15.
- Interviewer, the, ability of, to use prediction, 219-220; attitude of, in securing sex data, 29; control dependent upon skill of, 22-23, 26; success dependent upon devices used, 21-29; skill of, as determining adequacy of analysis, 12; technique of, and symbolization, 219-220.
- Interviewing technique, and symbolic nature of conflict elements, 219-220. *See also* Interview.
- J**
- Jewish Social Service Bureau, procedure in treatment of domestic discord at, xxiv.
- L**
- Language, differences in, and cultural conflict, 192.
- Life pattern, *see* Pattern of life.
- Life process, necessity of understanding sequence of events in, 216-217.
- Linkage, between factors in conflict situations, 212.
- Love, as dissociated from sex, 170; glorified in American culture, 191.
- M**
- Mannerisms, differences in, and cultural conflict, 192.
- Marriage, accord and discord factors in, 35, 36, and adjustment, 52; as characterized by conflict situations, 44; complicated by use of drink as an escape, 112-124; complicated by phantasy, 132-145; cultural conflict in, 191-212; and domestic discord, 35; as an escape mechanism, 90-91; invalid role in, 92; lack of preparation for, 91; origin of conflict in, 149-212; origin of conflict prior to, 35-148; and origin of sex conflict, 91; and personality conflict, 5, 44; response conflict and, 170-190; sex conflict and, 149-169; traditional attitude toward, 162; and use of escape mechanisms, 90, 91-92.
- Marriage partner, as substitute for earlier sources of response, 170.
- Marriage relations, exclusive character of, 150; pre-marital contacts and, 166-168; response in, 150, 170-190; sex in, 149-169.

Marriage relationships, *see* Marriage and Marriage relations.

Mechanisms, dissociation, 69, 70, 169, 255; drink, 50, 109-124, 256-257, 257-259; escape, 50, 107-108, 256-264; identification, 177, 189, 243-246; idealization, 126; illness, 50, 88-108; phantasy, 50, 125-145, 261-264; projection, 177-178; rationalization, 21, 59-66, 70, 71, 77-85, 98-105, 112, 119-122, 137-143, 144, 176-177, 183-187, 191, 206, 227-234; repression, 68-69, 86-87, 88, 110; sublimation, 189-190.

Mental conflict, *see* Conflict.

Mental tests, value of, 251.

Methodology, advantages of clinical method, 10-11; interview as used by Dickinson and Beam, 8; limitations of Hamilton's method, 9-10; limitations of questionnaire, 7; questionnaire combined with interview, 7; questionnaire as method of research, 6.

MOORE, BRUCE V., and BINGHAM, cited, 10 n.

Moral standards, relation to philosophy of life, 205-206.

Mores, differences in, and cultural conflict, 192, 193-198; differences in, arising after marriage, 198-206.

Mother-in-law, conflict with, 172-174.

MOWRER, ERNEST R., cited, 9, 10 n., 171 n., 216 n.

MOWRER, HARRIET R., cited, 9, 10 n.

O

Objectivity, in the interview, 25, 27; toward marriage partner, 247-248; toward own behavior, 29-30, 247.

Original nature, with reference to sex and response relations, 191.

Outline, of interview, 18-21.

Overt factors, in case of domestic discord, 221-238; as symbolic of covert processes, 219-220.

P

Parent-child conflict, illustrated, 221-238.

Parent-child relationships, crisis in, 173-174; determining role in fam-

ily, 39, 40-42; nature of, after marriage, 172-178.

Pattern of life, adjusted, definition of, 149; adjusted, and nature of treatment, 240; and adjusted personality, 37; analysis of, phantasy, 105-107, 143-145; in case of conflicting roles, 57-58; in case of drink, 117; in case of dual roles, 75-76; in case of illness as escape mechanism, 93-105; in case of phantasy, 132-143; in case of response conflict, 181; conflicting roles, type of, 50, 51-69; differentiation of, basis for, 51; definition of, 37; definition of unadjusted, 44-45; and drink, 125-145; dual-roles type of, 50, 70-87; and escape through illness, 88-108; formation of, 51; illustrated, 45-49; and marriage adjustment, 52; questions upon, 20-21; and unadjusted personality, 37; unadjusted, defined, 44-45; unconventional, 49; in V. case, 225.

Patterns, necessity for discovery of, in relation to treatment, 215, 221-238. *See also* Domestic discord patterns, Pattern of life, and Unadjusted life pattern.

Personality, adjusted, 37; and conflict, 51, 52; conflicting-roles type, 50, 51-69; cultural differences as basic in, 205-206; definition of, 36, deflation in, 89; depreciation of, in response conflict, 174; differences, and culture, vii-ix; and domestic discord, xxiii, 35, 36; and dominant role, 37; dual-roles type of, 70-87; dual-roles type defined, 71; effects of drink upon, 110-111; escape-response type of, 88-108; escape through drink, type of, 109-124; identification of attitudes with, 239; identification of, with parent, 177; modification of, in dual roles, 255; non-Jewish *vs.* Jewish in case of dual roles, 85-86; and primary attitudes, 240; and phantasy, 125-145; and roles, 36; study of, vii-viii; types of, 50, 51-69; unadjusted, 37, 44.

Personality disorganization, as determiner of domestic-discord pattern, 35, 212; as outgrowth of domestic-discord situation, 149, 212.

Phantasy, abnormal aspects of, 131; and ambiguous role, 128-129; analysis of case of, 143-145; as attempt to realize superior role, 132-145; case of, 132-143; and domestic discord, 125-145; as escape mechanism, 50, 125-145; forms of, 126; and idealization, 126; identification as form of, 126; illustration of, and ambiguous child role, 129-131; illustration of origin in unwanted child role, 127-128; normal nature of, 126-127; origin of, as escape mechanism, 127; treatment of, 262-264.

Philosophy of life, differentiation of, 206-207; as a directive agency, 206; as providing fund of rationalizations, 206.

Physician, services of, in treatment, 249.

Physiological tension, in sex relations, 153.

Prediction, in interview, 16, 17, 219-220.

Pregnancy, and abortion, 155; attitude of husband toward, 155; attitude of wife toward, 155; significance of, prior to marriage, 167-168.

Prejudices, and cultural conflict, 205.

Pre-marital relations, and marriage conflict, 166; symbolic significance of, 167-168.

Prestige, intellectual in the interview, 246.

Primary attitudes, origin of, 239; and treatment, 239-240.

Private consultant, procedure in treatment of domestic discord as, xxiv.

Process, domestic discord as a, 216-217; of redefinition of situations, 241; of reinterpretation of the individual's experiences, 241, 242-249.

Processes, of treatment, 239-274.

Projection, in response conflict, 177-178.

Propagation, and sex relations, 152.

Prostitute, nature of contacts with, 152.

Psychologist, the, services of, in treatment, 250-251.

Puritanical attitude, as hindering adjustment in marriage, 240; of wife in sex relations, 152-153.

Q

Questionnaire, *see* Methodology.

R

Rapport, basic to response relations, 188; intellectual, in interview, 246.

Rationalization, analysis of, in case of dual roles, 85; in cases of drink, 112; in case of phantasy, 144; consistency achieved by means of, 71; of cultural differences, 191, 208-212; and dissociation, 70; mechanism defined, 70; and philosophy of life, 206; and response relations, 176-177.

Rationalizations, in case of conflicting roles, 59-66; in case of drink, 119-122; in case of dual roles, 77-84; in case of phantasy, 137-143; in case of response conflict, 183-187; questions upon, 21; in V. case, 227-234.

Redefinition of situation, in case of dual roles, 255-256; illustration of, 241; relation to reinterpretation of life processes, 241; as type of treatment process, 241.

Reinterpretation of life processes, relation to redefinition of situations, 241; type of treatment process, 242-249.

Relatives, and response conflict, 170-178; and the treatment process, 251-252. *See also* In-laws.

Religion, differences in, and cultural conflict, 192.

Repression, drink as release from, 110; and escape-response pattern, 88; as mechanism for avoiding conflict, 86-87; as a mechanism for disguising conflict between roles, 88; as non-rational solution to conflict, 68-69.

Research, clinical method of, 10-11; need for further, 271; interview as method of, 7-8, 12-31; questionnaire as method of, 6-7, 9-10.

Response, characteristics of, in relations between husband and wife, 150; as a conflict pattern, 170-190; desire for, defined, 149 *n.*, 149-150; as differentiated from sex, 169; source of conflict in, 170-190; sublimation of, to children, 189-190.

Response conflict, case of, 178-187; case of, analyzed, 187-189; as differentiated from sex conflict, 151, 169;

- form taken in escape through illness, 92, 106-107; and in-laws, 170-178; as pattern of domestic discord, 170-190; as rationalized cultural conflict, 208; relation to cultural conflict, 190; relation to sex conflict, 92; as restricted to sex conflict, 150-151; and sublimation, 189-190; and symbolization, 172-189.
- Response-conflict pattern, differences in interests and, 178; differentiated from sex, 169; illustrated, 178-188; in-laws as factor in, 170-178; range of, 151; relation of, to cultural-conflict pattern, 190; sex conflict in case of, 187-188; sublimation and, 189-190; and symbolization, 172-189; as type of domestic discord, 170-190.
- Response Tension, *see* Response conflict.
- Role, and adjusted personality, 37; alternation between in dual-roles type, 255; ambiguous and phantasy, 128-129; definition of, 36; analysis of, 66-68; case of conflicting, 52-68; of child where domestic discord exists in family, 40-41; and communal relations, 42, 44, 45, 66; conflict between, 51; conflict between, disguised through repression, 88; conflicting, 50, 51-69; contradiction in, making for conflict, 45-49, 66; conventional, 66-68; definition of, 36, dominant, 37; escape from inferior, through phantasy, 125; factors determining, 38, 39, 43; family, 37-44; and health, 40; in-between, 43; illustration of, 128-131; infantile, 90; inferior, 38, 39, 43; non-conventional, 66-68; only-child, 42, 122; orphan, illustrated, 221-238; orphan, and phantasy, 127; and pattern of life, 37; and personality development, 37, 38; reinstatement through drink, 111-124; reinstatement through illness, 88-108; superior, 38, 39; of therapist, 239; and unadjusted personality, 37; unwanted child, and phantasy, 127; youngest child, 39, 90.
- Romanticism, as a philosophy of sex sublimation, 170.
- Romantic pattern, and cultural differences, 191.
- ## S
- Scientist, attitude of, 3-4.
- Separations, through emigration, 199-205; followed by reconciliations, 113; frequency of, in cases of drink, 113; and wishes of patients, 267.
- Sequences, circular nature of, 217-219; as consisting of overt behavior, 219; in domestic discord, 216.
- Sex, attitude toward, 152; discussion of, taboo, 152; differentiated from response, 169, lack of knowledge of, 152, 153; symbolic factors and, 162-168.
- Sex conflict, analysis of, in case of illness as an escape, 106, analysis of, in conflicting-roles type, 68; analysis of, in dual-roles type, 86; complex nature of, 151; and cultural conflict, 156-158, 191; as differentiated from response conflict, 151; differentiation of sex impulse of husband and wife and, 151-152; as a domestic-discord pattern, 149-169; and drink, 113, 123; and economic conflict, 156-158; and extra-marital relations, 156; fear of childbirth as factor in, 92; and husband's loss of virility, 159; illustrated, 160-162; and lack of sexual satisfaction, 153; origin of, 151, 250; and phantasy, 132, 144; in phantasy contrasted with other forms of escape response, 263; and pregnancy prior to marriage, 166-168; relation of, to response conflict, 92; source of, 91; symbolization of, illustrated, 162-163, 164-166; symbolic nature of, 162-168; where illness is used as escape, 92; and withholding of sex relations, 154-155.
- Sex desire, *see* Sex impulse.
- Sex factors, in case of conflicting roles, 57, 58-59; in case of drink, 116-117, 118; in Dr. Davis' study, 6-7; in case of dual roles, 75, 76-77; in case of illness as escape mechanism, 96, 97; in case of phantasy, 135, 137; in case of response con-

- flict, 180, 182; questions upon, 19, 20-21; in study of Dickinson and Beam, 8-9; in V. case, 224-225, 226-227.
- Sex hygiene, lack of knowledge of, 152; need for, 249; source of conflict in case of response conflict, 188; in treatment of escape response through illness, 261.
- Sex hygienist, the, co-ordination of treatment by, with general process, 249-250; services of, in treatment, 249-250.
- Sex impulse, differences in, cultural in nature, 152; differentiation of, 151-152, 158-159, 256; diminution of husband's, 159-162; education in appreciation of, 249.
- Sex relations, associated with child-birth, 91, 106; attitude toward, 91; in case of drink, 113; in case of illness as escape mechanism, 106; and case of response conflict, 187-188; conflict arising out of, prior to marriage, 166-168; conflict in, and other conflicts, 156-158; as a control technique, 153-154; diminution in, and jealousy, 156; extra-vaginal, 155-156; preparation of women for, 91; rebellion of wife in, 153-154; as shock, 91; symbolization and, 162-163; traditional attitude toward, 152-153.
- Sex shock, and first intercourse, 152, experienced by women, 152, 241; illustrated, 152-153.
- Sexual antagonism, and extra-marital relations, 156; relation of, to other conflicts, 156; as result of wife's stronger sex impulse, 159-162; of wife, 152-153.
- Sexual education, lack of, 152; need for, 249.
- Sexual inhibitions, of wife, 91, 106, 162.
- Sexual incompatibility; *see* Sexual conflict.
- Sexual intercourse, *see* Sex relations.
- Sexual maladjustment, physiological nature of, 250; psychological factors in, 250-251.
- Sexual satisfaction, as dissociated from response, 152; lack of, and extra-marital relations, 156; lack of, and fear of pregnancy, 155; lack of, and jealousy, 156, 166; lack of, and sex conflict, 153-154; lack of, and stronger sex desire of wife, 159.
- Social control, breakdown of, and adjustment of the immigrant, 199.
- Social interactions, in case of conflicting roles, 56, 59; in case of drink, 115-119, in case of dual roles, 74-77; in case of illness as escape mechanism, 95-98; in case of phantasy, 134-137; in case of response conflict, 180-183; questions upon, 19-21; in V. case, 224-227.
- Social therapy, *see* Therapy.
- Social therapist, *see* Therapist.
- Special ability tests, value of, 251.
- Specialists, services of, in treatment, 249-251.
- Standards of conduct, differences in, and cultural conflict, 192.
- Sterility, associations of, with, 159; inferiority and, 159-162.
- Sublimation, of response, 189-190.
- Superiority, achieved in phantasy, 132-145.
- Symbolic factors, in response conflict, 172-189; in sex conflict, 162-168.
- Symbolization, and desertion, 221; objects in, 163-164; and pregnancy prior to marriage, 167-168; and previous marriages, 164-166; process of, 162-168; and response conflict, 172-189.

T

- Techniques, of analysis, 215-238; of the interview, 12-31; of treatment, 239-274.
- Therapist, assumption of, 5; attitude of patient toward, 242; attitude toward relatives, 252-253; and cases of drink, 257-259; and cases of illness, 259-261; and conflicting-roles type, 253-255; co-ordination of treatment by, 248-249; and direction of treatment, 266; and dual-roles type, 255-256; and escape-response type, 256-264; and evaluation of treatment, 267-271; intellectual prestige of, 246; and interpretation, 243-246; and marriage-conflict patterns, 264-265; misled by temporary attitudes, 239; misled

by overt factors, 220-221; problem of, in treatment of unadjusted life pattern, 240-241; and process of interaction, 246; task of, 6, 221, 241-242.

Therapy, in case of drink, 257-259; in case of illness, 259-261; in conflicting-roles type, 253-255; direction of, 266-267; in dual-roles type, 255-256; in escape-response type, 256-264; evaluation of, 267-271; and marriage-conflict patterns, 264-265; in phantasy, 262-264; success of, dependent upon, 4; superficial nature of, 248.

THOMAS, W. I., cited, 149 *n*.

Treatment, and adjusted life pattern, 240; and analysis, 215-238; and attitudes toward sex, 240; as a check on analysis, 3, and circular nature of domestic-discord factors, 218-219; in conflicting-roles type, 253-255; direction of, 266; of drink, 257-259; in dual-roles type, 255-256; of dual roles contrasted with conflicting roles, 255; evaluation of, 267-271; evaluation of techniques used by social agencies, 9; facilitated by clinical interview, 11, of illness, 259-261; of illness as contrasted with drink, 257; interaction in process of, 246; interpretation to marriage partner in, 251; of marriage-conflict patterns, 264-265; nature of, 6, 239; need for integration of, 248; and personality adjustment, 6; and the physician, 249; and primary attitudes, 239; and process of changing attitudes, 216-217; and the psychologist, 250-251; redefinition of situation as technique of, 241; reinterpretation of life processes as technique of, 241; relation to analysis, 215-238; requisites of, 4; resulting in adjustment, 270; resulting in partial adjustment, 270-271; of segments, 248; and sex hygiene, 250; statistical findings of, 273-274; and the unadjusted life pattern, 240-241;

and understanding of life process, 216-217; understanding personality in, 5-6; use of relatives in, 251-252; variation in outcome, 274. *See also* Therapy.

Treatment processes, in cases of drink, 257-259; in case of illness, 259-261; in conflicting-roles type of domestic discord, 253-255; concerned with primary attitudes, 239; in dual-roles type, 255-256; in dual-roles type, contrasted with conflicting-roles type, 255; in escape-response type, 256-264; evaluation of, 267-271; illustrated, 241-242; instruction of marriage partner in, 251; and marriage-conflict patterns, 264-265, in phantasy, 262-264; the physician and, 249; resulting in adjustment, 270; resulting in partial adjustment, 270-271; statistical findings of, 273-274; types of, 241; use of relatives in, 251-252; use of sex hygiene in, 250; variations in outcome of, 274.

U

Unadjusted life patterns, classification of, 50; conflicting-roles type of, 50, 51-69; defined, 44-45; and dissociation, 69; and drink, 109-124; and domestic-discord patterns, 50; and escape-response pattern, 88-108; illustrated, 45-49; and nature of treatment, 240-241; and phantasy, 125-145; and repression, 88.

V

Venereal disease, and psychological impotency, 159.

Virility, conflict as result of loss of, 159-162; loss of, 159; loss of, and marked inferiority, 159, 159 *n.*, illustrated, 160-161.

Y

YOUNG, KIMBALL, Editor's Introduction, vii-xvii.

